Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/estimatesofcontr00well

Copyright by

Nancy Elisabeth Wells-Parker

1981

ESTIMATES OF CONTROL AND EFFICACY IN RELATION TO COPING STRATEGIES AND SUBJECTIVE STRESS IN FOUR COMMON LIFE ROLES

by

Nancy Elisabeth Wells-Parker

Department of Psychology
Duke University

Date: ____________________________

Approved:

____
Norman Guttman, Supervisor

____

____

____

____

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in the Department of
Psychology in the Graduate School
of Duke University

1981

ABSTRACT

(Psychology)

ESTIMATES OF CONTROL AND EFFICACY IN RELATION TO COPING STRATEGIES AND SUBJECTIVE STRESS IN FOUR COMMON LIFE ROLES

by

Nancy Elisabeth Wells-Parker

Department of Psychology
Duke University

Date: ________________________

Approved:

____
Norman Guttman, Supervisor

____

____

____

____

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of
Psychology in the Graduate School of
Duke University

1981

ABSTRACT

This study explored relationships between two types of perceptions--general control and relative efficacy--and (a) mode of coping and (b) subjective stress in the four roles of marriage, parenting, economic management, and occupation. General control refers to the amount of control that people, in general, are estimated to have over everyday problems, and relative efficacy refers to estimates of one's own capacity to solve and prevent everyday problems relative to the capacities of other people. The distinction between general control and relative efficacy was drawn from the "self-efficacy" model of Bandura (1977), and the revised "helplessness" model of Abramson, Seligman, and Teasdale (1978).

Scales for general control and relative efficacy in each of the four roles were developed in a pilot study using a sample of 122 adult women. Cronbach's alphas for the eight scales ranged from .68 to .87. Analyses confirmed the distinction between relative efficacy and general control.

Hypothesized relationships between general control estimates, relative efficacy estimates, coping modes, and subjective stress were assessed using a second sample of 202 adult women. Coping response modes, with passive and with active instrumental orientations, were defined on the basis of a study of coping by Pearlin and Schooler (1978). In each role, coping modes and subjective stress scores were regressed on the two role-specific estimates, income, education, age,

a measure of socially desirable response set, perceived role strain, and (for subjective stress) coping measures. The relative efficacy estimate was a significant predictor of reported frequency of use of passive coping modes in intensely personal roles of both marriage and parenting. The control estimate tended to be a significant predictor of (a) reported frequency of use of instrumental, active coping responses in occupation and (b) reported frequency of use of passive coping responses in economic management. Regarding subjective stress, either low estimates of relative efficacy or frequent use of efficacy-related passive coping response modes was related to high levels of subjective stress in all roles except occupation. Also, low relative efficacy estimates were related to high levels of depression and low levels of self-esteem.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have substantially contributed to the research presented in this dissertation. I wish to thank Dr. Norman Guttman, chairman of my doctoral committee, whose unfailing wisdom, knowledge, support and guidance have been invaluable to the inception and completion of the research. Also, I wish to thank the other members of my graduate committee--Dr. Linda K. George, Dr. Gregory A. Kimble, Dr. Robert C. Carson, and Dr. Philip R. Costanzo--for their guidance.

Additionally, the moral support of my husband, Bill, and my parents, Mr. and Mrs. John S. Wells have made this dissertation possible. They also contributed their organizational and editorial skills to the project. Others who contributed to the research by assisting in the distribution of questionnaires include: Shirley Cameron, James Darby, James Landrum, Joy and Harry Mills, Linda Morse, Julian Pigford, Carla Randle, Barbara Spencer, James Stafford, Bill Sugg, Allie Vance, and Carole Wells. I would also like to thank my aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. Claude H. Wells, for graciously opening their home to me during the many visits to North Carolina that I made in connection with the completion of my doctoral work. Also, Mrs. Betty Elliott skillfully typed the completed manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

[illegible] to express [illegible]

[illegible]

direction [illegible] doctoral [illegible]

support and guidance [illegible]

completion of [illegible]

[illegible]

Dr. Robert E. Bateman [illegible]

Additionally, [illegible]

parents, [illegible]

possible. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Jackie [illegible]

[illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS v

LIST OF TABLES viii

Chapter
I. THE PROBLEM 1

Introduction
Development of General Hypotheses on the Basis of Pearlin and Schooler's Study
Summary of Hypotheses

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON CONTROL INSTRUMENTS 18

Locus of Control
Utility of the Control and Efficacy Distinction for the Prediction of Coping Responses
Utility of Area Specific Scales
Asymmetries in Ascriptions for Positive and Negative Outcomes; Sexual Differences in Response to Control Measures
Format of Control Scales
Implications of Cited Research for the Problem Under Investigation

III. PILOT STUDY: DEVELOPMENT OF ROLE SPECIFIC EFFICACY AND CONTROL SCALES 29

Development of Scale Items
Organization of the Questionnaire
Sample
Results

IV. METHODOLOGY, DATA COLLECTION, PROPERTIES OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS AND STATEMENT OF SPECIFIC HYPOTHESES 53

Key Variables
Exogenous Variables and Perceived Strain
Final Questionnaire
Sample
Psychometric Properties of Control and Efficacy Scales
Psychometric Properties of Coping Response Scales

Subjective Stress Scales
Self-Esteem Scale
Description of Responses to Key Scales
Statement of Specific Hypotheses
Statistical Analysis

V. RESULTS 93

Correlations Between Exogenous Variables and Key Variables
Zero-Order Correlations Between Control Estimates Efficacy Estimates, and Dependent Variables
Regression Analyses of Coping Responses
Regression Analyses of Subjective Stress
Regression Analysis of Self-Esteem
Are Role Specific Control and Efficacy Estimates Superior to Generalized Estimates Regarding Prediction of Coping Responses?

VI. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION 125

. . . .

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 136

Item Key

Appendix 2 147

Supplementary Information for the Pilot Study

Appendix 3 151

Supplementary Information for the Final Study

Appendix 4 160

Supplementary Regression Tables

Appendix 5 173

Questionnaire from Final Study

REFERENCES 186

REFERENCE NOTES 192

LIST OF TABLES

1. Internal Consistencies for Initial Control Efficacy Scales 33
2. Internal Consistencies for Revised Control and Efficacy Scales 35
3. Correlations Between Scales (Pearson's r) and Internal Consistencies (Cronbach's Alpha) for Scales 37
4. A Principal Factor Analysis of Control and Efficacy Items in Marriage 38
5. A Principal Factor Analysis of Control and Efficacy Items in Occupation 40
6. A Principal Factor Analysis of Control and Efficacy Items in Parenting 41
7. A Principal Factor Analysis of Control and Efficacy Items in Economics 42
8. A Principal Factor Analysis of Control Items 43
9. Descriptive Statistics for Scales in the Pilot Study 46
10. Correlations Between Control Scales and Exogenous Variables 48
11. Partial Correlations Between Efficacy Scales, Control Scales, and the BDI 50
12. Partial Correlations Between Composite Control Estimate, Composite Efficacy Estimate, and Depression Controlling for Exogenous Variables and the Other Estimate 51
13. A Principal Factor Analysis of Control and Efficacy Items in Economics 59
14. A Principal Factor Analysis of Control and Efficacy Items in Occupation 61
15. A Principal Factor Analysis of Control and Efficacy Items in Marriage 63
16. A Principal Factor Analysis of Control and Efficacy Items in Parenting 64
17. Internal Consistencies (Cronbach's Alpha) for Efficacy and Control Scales and Correlations (Pearson's r) Between Scales 65
18. A Principal Factor Analysis of All Control Items 67
19. A Principal Factor Analysis of Coping Response Items in Economics 69
20. A Principal Factor Analysis of Coping Response Items in Occupation 71
21. A Principal Factor Analysis of Coping Response Items in Parenting 73
22. A Principal Factor Analysis of Coping Response Items in Marriage 75
23. Internal Consistencies (Cronbach's Alpha) of Coping Scales and Correlations (Pearson's r) Between Scales . . . 76

24. Internal Consistencies (Cronbach's Alpha) Between Stress Scales and Correlations (Pearson's r) Between Scales 78
25. Descriptive Statistics for Control and Efficacy Scales 79
26. Descriptive Statistics for Exogenous Variables, Strain, Stress, Coping, and Self-Esteem Scales 82
27. Zero-Order Correlations (Pearson's r) of Role Scales with Role Strain and Other Variables 94
28. Active/Passive Coping Marriage: A Regression Analysis 98
29. Passive Coping in Parenting: A Regression Analysis 100
30. Passive Coping in Parenting: A Regression Analysis in Which a Composite Personal Control Scale is Substituted for the Role Specific Control Scale 102
31. Active Coping in Parenting: A Regression Analysis 104
32. Passive Coping in Occupation: A Regression Analysis 105
33. Active Coping in Occupation: A Regression Analysis 107
34. Passive Coping in Economic Management: A Regression Analysis 109
35. Subjective Stress in Marriage: A Regression Analysis 110
36. Subjective Stress in Parenting: A Regression Analysis 113
37. Subjective Stress in Occupation: A Regression Analysis 115
38. Subjective Stress in Economic Management: A Regression Analysis 117
39. Self-Esteem: A Regression Analysis 119
40. Betas for Composite Efficacy and Control Estimates Compared to Betas for Role Specific Efficacy and Control Estimates from Regression Analyses of Coping and Stress in Each Role 121
41. Assessment of Effects of Order of Scale Administration on Efficacy and Control Scale Scores 150
42. Zero-Order Correlations Between Role Specific Control and Efficacy Scales, and Corresponding Role Specific Coping Responses and Stress 152
43. Correlations (Pearson's r) Between the Rotter I-E Scale, Role Efficacy and Control Scales, and Other Variables 155
44. Correlations of the Rotter I-E Scale and Role Specific Control Scales with Role Specific Dependent Variables 157
45. Regression Analysis of Separate Active and Passive Coping Scales in Marriage 158
46. Betas for Efficacy Estimates After Self-Esteem Enters Each of Twelve Regression Analyses 159
47. Active/Passive Coping in Marriage: Supplement to Table 28 162
48. Passive Coping in Parenting: Supplement to Table 29 163

49. Active Coping (Discipline) in Parenting: Supplement to Table 31 164
50. Passive Coping in Occupation: Supplement to Table 32 165
51. Active Coping in Occupation: Supplement to Table 33 166
52. Passive Coping in Economic Management: Supplement to Table 34 167
53. Subjective Stress in Marriage: Supplement to Table 35 168
54. Subjective Stress in Parenting: Supplement to Table 36 169
55. Subjective Stress in Occupation: Supplement to Table 37 170
56. Subjective Stress in Economic Management: Supplement to Table 38 171
57. Self-Esteem: Supplement to Table 39 172

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The general problem under investigation is the relationship between how people perceive the amount of control that they have over outcomes in daily life and the process of coping with common life strains. The common wisdom in the "Alcoholic's Prayer" states, "grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change; courage to change the things I can, and wisdom to know the difference" (Alcoholics Anonymous, 1953). This wisdom connects choice of coping mode with perceptions of control and suggests that the prudent person will vary mode of coping with the likelihood of controlling the outcome.

On the other hand, a strong belief in personal control receives clear emphasis within contemporary American society. For instance, the Protestant work ethic (suggesting that persistence even in the face of unfavorable odds will lead to success) is commonly articulated and is subject to considerable social reinforcement. In diverse literature in psychology and sociology both the perception of controllability and the experience of active control has generally been viewed as adaptive. For instance, the inability to escape or to avoid negative outcomes is hypothesized as being central to the development of depression (Seligman, 1975). Additional examples are found within the literature on alienation. In this literature the experience and perception of control

within the context of work are frequently posited as central to the conception of self as valuable and worthwhile as well as being central to involvement with the work role (Kanuango, 1979).

In everyday life, negative outcomes (e.g., failure, frustration, etc.) do occur and may not be under the control of the individual. Problems of society become increasingly complex, and the possibility of control also becomes increasingly uncertain. Behavior that is appropriate when one clearly controls the situation may be inappropriate when personal control is uncertain or unlikely and actions to achieve control may exacerbate the source of the problem White (1974) agrues:

> In actuality, of course, there are many situations that can be met by compromise or even resignation. Events may occur that require us to give in, relinquish things we would have liked, perhaps change direction or restrict the range of our activities. We may have no recourse but to accept a permanent impoverishment of our lives and try to make the best of it. Furthermore, when dangers are real and information incomplete it is in no sense adaptive to march boldly forward. (p. 50)

What types of coping responses are associated with recognition of limited control? Is any relationship between perceived lack of control and negative states (such as depression, emotional distress, or low self-esteem) altered by other variables such as the type of coping response employed or the area of life in which threatening situations are encountered? In the ensuing discussion, perceptions of control are linked to the type of coping response employed, and several conditions that might mediate the relationship between perceived lack of control (also called helplessness) and intensity of subjective stress are suggested. Additionally, implications of models that differentiate *types* or *sources* of helplessness are considered in terms of describing the coping process. These two sources of helplessness are: (a) the estimation that no contingency between action and outcome exists *in*

general (general control) and (b) the estimation of one's own ability to execute actions that might control the outcome as being insufficient or inferior (personal efficacy or, for brevity, efficacy). The models suggesting these distinctions are those of Abramson, Seligman and Teasdale (1978), and Bandura (1977).

Additionally, the sphere or role of life to which the outcome (that is believed to be uncontrollable) belongs may mediate the interrelationships among estimations of helplessness, coping modes, and feelings of distress. In developing general hypotheses regarding interrelationships between coping and estimations of helplessness, four categories of theoretically interesting concepts are: (a) types of control perceptions (general control estimates vs. efficacy estimates), (b) types of coping responses (action-oriented or passive), (c) spheres of life to which outcomes belong (i.e., intensely personal or impersonal life roles), and (d) perceptions of stress, self-esteem, and depression. Theoretical models and empirical research that further define and interrelate these categories of variables are discussed in order to provide a basis for integrating these concepts into specific hypotheses. One general model of coping that explicitly defines types of coping responses and that postulates an association between estimations of control, types of coping responses employed, and perceptions of stress is that of Lazarus and Launier (1978). Following presentation of this model, the several models (cited above) relevant to the distinction between estimations of general control and estimations of efficacy are discussed. Finally, consideration of an empirical study providing operational definitions of active and passive coping in two impersonal and two intensely personal life roles will provide a context for investigating

relationships between estimations of control/helplessness and coping within each type of role.

A General Model of Coping

Lazarus and Launier (1978) present a detailed analysis of coping and stress. In this model, perceived stress may involve the perceptions of past or present damage (harm/loss), threat (anticipated harm), or challenge (anticipated risk). (Threat and challenge differ primarily in the tone of the interpretation.) Three processes are used to describe the experience of stress. Initially, stress is perceived (primary appraisal), coping options are appraised (secondary appraisal), and stress is reappraised (reappraisal).[1]

According to Lazarus and Launier (1978), coping involves "efforts both action oriented and intrapsychic, to manage environmental and internal demands and conflicts . . . which tax or exceed a person's resources" (p.311). Two coping functions described are instrumental functions and palliation functions (i.e., emotional regulation). Coping modes include: (a) information seeking that can be instrumental in providing information for action, or palliative in making a person feel better, (b) direct action that may be instrumental or palliative (e.g., taking a tranquilizer), (c) inhibition of action (that may be either instrumental or palliative), and (d) intrapsychic (that is primarily palliative but may be instrumental). Lazarus and Launier (1978) cite, as an example of an instrumental intrapsychic coping response, focusing

---

[1] In this model it is not assumed that the proposed steps occur in some rigid order or that a conscious deliberate assessment is a necessary requisite to the employment of coping strategies (Lazarus, 1978). Ryle (1952) also points out that, "knowing what we are about does not entail an incessant actual monitoring or scrutiny of our doings or feelings" (p. 161).

on one's extensive preparation for the exam and one's positive qualities in order to reduce anxiety while taking the exam.

In discussing the choice of coping mode, Lazarus and Launier (1978) suggest that type of coping mode employed will be related to: (a) uncertainty (hypothesized to be associated with information seeking and intrapsychic coping modes), (b) degree of appraised threat (severe levels hypothesized to be associated with primitive modes), (c) conflict (hypothesized to be associated with intrapsychic modes), and (d) helplessness. Regarding helplessness, Lazarus and Launier (1978) posit that "direct action is predicated on the secondary appraisal that one can do something to restore harm-loss or compensate for it or that there is a way to prevent a threatened harm from happening" (p. 321). The ensuing discussion will be primarily concerned with the fourth variable, helplessness.

Distinction Between Types of Helplessness

The coping model above posits a connection between coping and the belief that outcomes are not subject to individual control. Other models make a distinction between types of helplessness and suggest that distinct types of helplessness should make independent contributions to coping and the perception of stress. One such model is concerned primarily with the relation between each type of helplessness and the variables of depression and self-esteem. The second model to be considered specifically relates two sources of helplessness--efficacy expectancies and outcome expectancies--to coping.

Abramson et al., (1978) distinguish between "personal helplessness," i.e., the belief that an outcome is not contingent on any response in the person's own repertoire but that outcome is "contingent

on the response in the repertoire of a relevant other" (p. 53), and "universal helplessness" (the belief that the outcome is not contingent either on a response in the individual's own repertoire or one in that of any member of an appropriate reference group). Thus it is predicted that either type of helplessness will lead to impaired initiation of responses directed toward influencing the outcome and sadness, but that only personal helplessness will be associated with low self-esteem.

Bandura (1977) makes a related distinction between outcome and efficacy expectancies:

> Outcome and efficacy expectations are differentiated, because individuals can believe that a particular course of action will produce certain outcomes, but if they entertain serious doubts about whether they can perform the necessary activities, such information does not influence their behavior. (p. 195)

Bandura suggests that a belief in self-efficacy is central to understanding coping adequacy. According to Bandura (1977), efficacy expectations influence both the "initiation and persistence of coping behavior" (p. 193). In his analysis, efficacy expectancies vary in magnitude (i.e., they may be limited to simple tasks or extend to complex and difficult tasks), generality, and strength (i.e., they may or may not be easily extinguished by contrary information).

Bandura (1977) suggests that efficacy and outcome expectancies have different implications for coping and adaptation. Altering efficacy expectations and altering outcome expectations may require different approaches:

> People can give up trying because they lack a sense of efficacy in achieving the required behavior, or they may be assured of their capabilities but give up trying because they expect their behavior to have no effect on an unresponsive environment or to be consistently punished. These two separable expectancy sources of futility have quite different antecedents and remedial implications. To alter efficacy-based futility requires development

> of competencies and expectations of personal effectiveness. By contrast, to change outcome-based futility necessitates changes in prevailing environmental contingencies that restore the instrumental value of the competencies that people already possess. (Bandura, 1977: pp. 204-205)

In the above model, a robust and generalized sense of high efficacy is viewed as adaptive across many contexts. A robust sense of high efficacy in no way contradicts the potential adaptiveness of recognition of realistic threats. According to Bandura (1977), "a few negative encounters among many will, at most, establish discriminative avoidance of realistic threats" (p. 202). Thus, Bandura (1977) suggests that expectations regarding personal efficacy and expectations regarding the extent to which the outcome is controllable should be distinct and should contribute independently to the employment of coping responses, particularly those involving action to alter the outcome.

Abramson et al., (1978) point to the similarity between the concept of "self-efficacy" (Bandura, 1977) and their concept of "personal helplessness." Both concepts refer to an individual's estimation of her or his own ability to effectively execute an action that would alter an outcome. The "personal helplessness" concept (Abramson, et al., 1978) is a relative concept of efficacy involving social comparisons. Clearly, Bandura's reference to "outcome expectancies" and the concept of "universal helplessness" both relate to the estimation of the extent of response/outcome contingencies in general.

A major purpose of the pilot study presented in subsequent chapters is to ascertain whether estimations involving general control and estimations involving efficacy are in fact distinct, and the final study addresses the question of whether these two types of estimates independently account for selection of coping responses, emotional

distress, depression and self-esteem. In order to explore these interrelationships, it is necessary to identify relevant empirical research that further suggests specific hypotheses about these relationships. In a recent study by Pearlin and Schooler (1978), definitions are provided for several coping responses in four life roles. While the intent of the Pearlin and Schooler study was not specifically to explore the relationship between control (or helplessness) estimates, coping, and stress, findings regarding the differential relationships between specific types of coping responses and subjective stress within specific life roles are suggestive of the way in which control estimates may mediate how one copes, and how distressed one becomes when confronted with strain in daily life roles.

Coping and Subjective Stress in Four Life Roles

Pearlin and Schooler (1978) defined coping responses that people may employ when confronted with everyday life strains in marriage, parenting, economic management, and occupation. Also, the relationships between the employment of specific coping responses and levels of role stress within each role were explored. These investigators defined: (a) strain as the "enduring problems that have the potential for arousing threat" (p. 3), (b) stress as the "reported experience of emotional upset" (p. 4), (c) coping as the "behaviors, cognitions and perceptions in which people engage when actually contending with their life problems" (p. 5), and (d) resources as enduring attributes (e.g., self-esteem).

Measures of stress, strain, and coping were independently developed within each of the four roles employing a principal component

analysis of scored intensive interview data. Coping responses were derived in a similar manner. These responses included responses directed toward modification of the strain (i.e., negotiation in marriage, discipline in parenting, and optimistic action in occupation). However, the majority of the responses identified were directed toward controlling the meaning (i.e., the personal consequences) of the strain (i.e., "selective ignoring" in all roles, "the substitution of rewards" in occupation, "devaluation of money" in economic management, and "positive comparisons" in all role areas), or involved efforts to manage stress (i.e., "emotional discharge and "passive forebearance" in marriage, "resignation" in parenting and "optimistic faith" in economic management). Responses involving advice seeking were also identified in marriage and parenting. Many of the responses directed toward controlling meaning or stress management had a distinct passive versus active orientation. Indeed, the stress management and controlled meaning responses could provide operational definitions for the palliative, intrapsychic (passive) responses of Lazarus and Launier (1978), while the direct action responses identified by Pearlin and Schooler (1978) could provide operational definitions for the instrumental, direct action responses of Lazarus and Launier (1978).

Development of General Hypotheses on the Basis of Pearlin and Schooler's Study

Coping Responses, General Control and Efficacy

It might be expected from the efficacy model of Bandura (1977) that the employment of instrumental, direct action coping modes, in terms of Lazarus and Launier (1978), would be a function both of estimates of efficacy and estimates of general control. Pearlin and

Schooler (1978) distinguished three direct action responses (i.e., negotiation in marriage, discipline in parenting, and optimistic action in occupation). It is expected here that the reported employment of these three responses will be a function of both efficacy estimates and general control estimates within each role.

On the other hand, it is not as clear (from existing models) that efficacy or general control estimates would be related to the employment of coping responses in the intrapsychic mode. If response/outcome noncontingency is perceived, it would logically follow that coping in the intrapsychic (as opposed to the instrumental direct action mode) would be most appropriate. Also, upon examining the coping responses delineated by Pearlin and Schooler (1978), at least eight of the responses classified as controlling meaning or managing stress seem to have a distinct passive orientation. For instance, the "selective ignoring" response (identified for all roles) contains such items as: (a) "How often do you just wait for difficulties to work themselves out?" (p. 20; marriage), (b) "I can put up with a lot on my job as long as the pay is good." (p. 21; occupation), (c) "Just accept the money pinch because there's little you can do about it." (p. 21; economic management), and (d) "How often do you think it's behavior that they will just outgrow?" (p. 21; parenting). One coping response ("helpless resignation" in parenting) seems to specifically involve estimations of low control in combination with an accepting attitude.

The following coping responses defined by Pearlin and Schooler (1978) involve a distinctly passive rather than active orientation:

1. Marriage
    a. "Selective ignoring"
    b. "Passive forbearance"

2. Parenting
    a. "Helpless resignation"
    b. "Selective ignoring"

3. Economic management
    a. "Optimistic faith"
    b. "Selective ignoring"

4. Occupation
    a. "Substitution of rewards"
    b. "Selective ignoring"

These responses may be classified in Lazarus and Launier's system as intrapsychic; however, they might also involve the inhibition of action (e.g., keeping out of a spouses way when problems arise, "passive forebearance"). Crosscutting such distinctions is the passive orientation of these responses. Indeed, factor analyses of the above coping responses and the active responses in each role suggest (in Chapter IV) a bipolar active/passive dimension with items from the above responses representing the passive pole, and items from the active responses representing an active pole in some roles.

While the employment of these passively oriented responses may be more likely under conditions of uncertainty and ambiguity (Lazarus and Launier, 1978), they also may be associated with the belief that the situation is not amenable to control by anyone (i.e., an estimation of low general control), or the belief that self is deficient in the skills that are a requisite to controlling the response (i.e., an estimation of low efficacy). Therefore, it is hypothesized that the eight passive responses (listed above) are related to estimates of general control and estimates of efficacy. It is expected that more frequent (reported) usage of the passive responses and less frequent usage of the active responses will be associated with lower estimates of general control or lower estimates of efficacy.

Subjective Stress, Efficacy, Control and Coping

Pearlin and Schooler (1978) found that lower (reported) frequency of usage of the four passive responses in intensely personal roles (i.e., marriage and parenting) was related to lower levels of subjective stress in each personal role.[2] Generally, these passive responses involved avoidance of involvement, commitment, and interaction. Pearlin and Schooler (1978) concluded:

> In marriage it is a reflective probing of problems, rather than the eruptive discharge of feelings created by the problems, that is among the most effective responses. Similarly, the most effective types of response to parental strains is not resigned helplessness, but the conviction that one can exert a potent influence over one's children. It appears that problems arising in the close interpersonal relations of family are least likely to result in stress when people remain committed to and involved in those relationships. (p. 16)

Perhaps, the more general belief that problems within intensely personal relationships are highly amenable to personal control might also be associated with lower levels of subjective stress. Indeed, it has been generally held that the belief in control (i.e., the belief that contingency relationships exist between individual action and outcome for people in general) is associated with lower levels of perceived stress (Lazarus and Launier, 1978). Also, the concept of an "illusion of control" being associated with low depression has been suggested on the basis of a series of laboratory studies. Alloy and Abramson (1979) found that nondepressed subjects consistently overestimated contingencies under certain highly artificial laboratory conditions, while depressed subjects were actually more accurate than

---

[2] The relationship between levels of subjective stress and coping responses was always assessed with perceived intensity of environmental role strain held constant (i.e., statistically controlled).

nondepressed subjects in estimating contingency relationships. They suggested that an "illusion of control" may be characteristic of nondepressed individuals. On the other hand, it is conceivable that failure to recognize real restraints, especially systematic and stable constraints (such as those that may be typically associated with impersonal roles of life), could be associated with more intense negative affect following failures in active, externally directed coping.

Pearlin and Schooler's analysis of subjective stress suggests that use of the passive responses in impersonal (occupational and economic) roles may be associated with lower levels of subjective stress in those roles. Passive responses in impersonal roles tend to be directed toward acceptance of negative conditions, withdrawal from action in the role, and shifting of attention away from both problems and rewards associated with those roles. In contrast to intensely personal roles, more frequent employment of such passive responses in occupation and economics was found to be statistically related to lower levels of subjective stress in those impersonal roles. Regarding these personal roles, Pearlin and Schooler (1978) concluded:

> With relatively impersonal strains, such as those stemming from occupational and economic experiences, the most effective forms of coping involve the manipulation of goals and values in a way which psychologically increases the distance from the problems. (p. 18)

Regarding the strains that are typically associated with such impersonal roles, Pearlin and Schooler (1978) suggested:

> Many of the problems stemming from arrangements deeply rooted in social and economic organization may exert powerful effect on personal life but be impervious to personal efforts to change them. This perhaps is the reason that much of our coping functions only to help endure that which we cannot avoid. (p. 18)

Indeed, the delineated passive coping responses in occupation

and economics may be associated with a realization that powerful systematic constraints on personal control exist. Possibly, failure to recognize such constraints (overestimating control) could be associated with more intense negative affect in such impersonal roles. This prediction is at odds with the usual expectation that a sense of limited control is associated with more intense negative affect (see Chapter II). An alternative to the unusual hypothesis (that lower control estimates will be related to lower levels of subjective stress in impersonal roles) can, however, be proposed. In the previous section, it was hypothesized that lower control estimates would be related to higher reported usage of passive coping responses. Perhaps, in impersonal roles, an individual who estimates control to be low _and_ who employs passive responses may either be less distressed or no more distressed than the individual who maintains high control estimates. On the other hand, the individual who estimates low control and who _does not_ frequently employ passive coping responses may experience the highest levels of stress. Therefore, if passive coping and low control estimations are statistically related, statistically controlling for passive coping would be expected to alter the relationship between control and subjective stress. Under this hypothesis it would be expected that lower estimates of general control would be related to higher levels of stress _only when frequency of passive coping is statistically controlled_. In contrast, in intensely personal roles, it is expected that lower control estimates will be related to higher levels of subjective stress whether or not passive coping is taken into account.[3]

---

[3] Of course, the distinction between personal and impersonal roles is not suggested as an absolute one. It is merely suggested that,

It is expected that high efficacy estimates will generally be associated with lower levels of subjective stress, regardless of role area. An additional hypothesis derived from the model of Abramson, et al., (1978) is proposed regarding efficacy estimations. It is hypothesized that efficacy but not general control, will be directly and independently related to self-esteem.

Summary of Hypotheses

On the basis of the preceding discussion, the following hypotheses are suggested:

Hypothesis 1: In each role (marriage, parenting, economic management, and occupation) estimates regarding the general controllability of the outcome will be associated with choice of coping mode. Specifically, (low) estimates of general control will be related to (high) usage of passive responses and (high) estimates of control will be associated with (high) usage of active responses.

Hypothesis 2: In each role, estimates regarding personal efficacy will be associated with choice of coping mode. Specifically, (low) estimates of efficacy will be related to (high) usage of passive responses, and (high) estimates of efficacy will be related to (high) frequency of usage of active responses in each role.

Hypothesis 3: (High) efficacy estimates should be related to (low) levels of subjective stress in both personal and impersonal roles.

Hypothesis 4: In accord with Pearlin and Schooler's findings (Pearlin and Schooler, 1978) it is expected that (high) frequency of

---

on the average, outcomes in impersonal roles are more likely to be under the control of obvious systematic constraints than are outcomes in more personal roles.

passive coping will be related to (high) levels of subjective stress in intensely personal roles and to (low) levels of subjective stress in impersonal roles.

Hypothesis 5: It is expected that (high) estimates of general control will be related to low levels of subjective stress only in intensely personal roles (marriage and parenting) when frequency of usage of passive coping is not taken into account. In impersonal roles (economic management and occupation), it is expected that usage of passive coping will specify the relationship between general control estimates and subjective stress. In impersonal roles (high) general control estimates are expected to be related to (low) levels of subjective stress only when frequency of passive coping is controlled statistically.

Hypothesis 6: (High) efficacy estimates should be related to (high) self-esteem.

(Operational definitions for key variables in the above hypotheses and an explanation of variables to be controlled in testing the above hypotheses are given in Chapter IV, following development of scales for efficacy and control in the pilot study.)

Scope of the Study

Although the hypothesized relationships involving control estimates, efficacy estimates and coping might be extended to many contexts involving not only mundane situations but rare and discrete life events such as illness or death of significant others, I limited the scope of my investigation to those common strains encountered routinely in the four roles of everyday life (marriage, parenting, economics, and occupation). I limited sampling to adult women of

diverse socioeconomic levels and life situations. The sample was restricted to women between the ages of 21 and 64 years in order to maximize the likelihood that subjects would be actively engaged in several of the aforementioned life roles. (The decision to limit the study to women is discussed more fully in the next chapter.)

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON CONTROL INSTRUMENTS

The intent of my research is the investigation of hypothesized associations between efficacy estimates, general control estimates, coping, subjective stress, and self-esteem. These relationships will be evaluated within four life roles (marriage, parenting, economic management, and occupation). Factors from the study of Pearlin and Schooler (1978) can provide operational definitions for both coping responses and subjective stress in those roles, but no instrument currently exists (in the literature) that contains separate efficacy and general control scales for the roles of interest. However, several measures of generalized control expectancies exist, and a considerable body of literature deals specifically with the relation of these scales and variables of coping, self-esteem, depression, and other psychological indices. Relevant selections from this literature are considered in the following discussion in order to provide a rationale and guide for operationally defining the efficacy and control concepts utilized in the research presented in subsequent chapters.

Locus of Control

Rotter's locus of control concept was conceived out of social learning theory in which behavior potential is viewed as a function of expectancy, reinforcement value, and the psychological situation (Rotter,

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] association [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] management [illegible] School [illegible] responsible [illegible] currently [illegible] and [illegible] magazines [illegible] body [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1966). Locus of control was defined as a generalized expectancy regarding control. A distinction was made between generalized and specific control expectancies (Rotter, Chance, and Phares, 1972). General expectancies would be modified by information and experience with a particular situation; therefore, a specific expectancy of control for that situation would become differentiated from the general expectancy. Generalized expectancies would be most relevant regarding behavior in novel situations, while specific control expectancies would be most relevant in familiar situations (Rotter, 1975). Rotter was also concerned with the parameters of expectancy generalization and suggested that gradients of generalization would be steeper in normal than in pathological populations (Rotter et al., 1972), or (otherwise expressed) that pathology is characterized by failure to discriminate degrees of controllability among situations.

The Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale was developed primarily as a measure of generalized expectancy in which internal control expectancies were equated with skill and external control expectancies were equated with chance (Rotter, 1966). The resulting Rotter I-E Scale consists of 23 forced choice dyads, each containing one statement designed to reflect external control and one statement designed to reflect internal control. The scale is scored in the external direction; therefore, a high score usually indicates high external control expectancies.

Positive correlations have been reported between the Rotter I-E Scale and many indices of maladaptation including anxiety (Lowery, Jacobsen, and Keane, 1975; Phares, 1975), overt hostility (Abramowitz, Abramowitz, Roback, and Jackson, 1974), and accident proneness (Williams

and Nickels, 1969). Modest negative correlations have been reported between the Rotter Scale and many indices of adaptation including psychological well-being (Phares and Lamiell, 1974), insight (Naditch, 1975), and facilitating anxiety (Phares, 1975).

Also Rotter's I-E Scale has been related to specific achievement behaviors and coping responses within laboratory settings. Again, a variety of deficits have been associated with high scores, and appropriate or adaptive coping responses have been associated with low scores (Lefcourt, 1976; Phares, 1975; Rotter, 1975; Strickland, 1978). For instance, Davis and Phares (1967) selected college students with extremely high and extremely low scores. When subjects anticipated attempting to influence another person on future tasks, low scorers ("internals") engaged in more information seeking under skill and no instruction conditions than did high scorers ("externals"). However, when low scorers believed that the other person's performance would be entirely determined by chance, they did not seek more information. Also, subjects who scored low on the Rotter I-E Scale attributed control externally when salient cues regarding external control were present, while high scorers made external attributions even in the absence of such cues (Wolk and Ducette, 1974).

Lefcourt (1976) suggested that subjects scoring low on the Rotter scale sought more information under appropriate circumstances, attended to cues of lower salience, were more aware of information pertinent to their condition, and utilized important environmental input more appropriately than did subjects with high scores. Therefore, low scores on the Rotter Scale did not apparently reflect rigid internal control expectancies.

A controversial issue within the locus-of-control literature involves the question of whether high generalized expectancies of external control may ever be associated with adaptive responses. Phares (1975) suggested that "externality" may sometimes involve adequate defensive responding. Within an experimenter-induced failure paradigm, high scorers, but not low scorers, devalued a task that was initially rated as high in importance (Phares, 1971). Phares (1975) suggested that devaluation of the outcome can be an adequate defense. Devaluation, as an appropriate coping response, has been suggested in circumstances in which values can be easily manipulated (Pearlin and Schooler, 1978), or when the outcome is initially of relatively low importance (Rotter, 1975). Phares (1975) also cited evidence that high scorers remembered failure more accurately than low scorers, and suggested that low scorers had more of a need to forget failure, but Lefcourt (1976) suggested that failure may have been more irritating to high scorers than to low scorers and, therefore, was recalled more accurately by high scorers.

Unfortunately, interpretation of the meaning of relationships reported between the Rotter I-E Scale and coping or psychological indices is clouded because estimates regarding general control may be confounded in the Rotter I-E Scale with estimates of self-esteem, or self-efficacy. Bandura (1977) specifically points to the failure within most of the locus-of-control literature to distinguish between beliefs regarding contingencies between action and outcome and the perception of personal efficacy (i.e., the belief that one is capable of performing the behaviors necessary to achieve control). He cites as an example of this distinction a child who believes that skill determines arithmetic

grades but also believes that he lacks the necessary skills.

In addition, items in the Rotter I-E Scale that are merely self-denigrating or reflective of a negative mood are used as external control statements. For instance, several studies of the Rotter I-E Scale suggest that some external items evidence a negative mood apart from content (Lamont, 1972; Naditch, 1975), and appear to be more self-denigrating than external. This type of item is exemplified by the item stating, "Sometimes I feel I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking" (Rotter, 1966, p. 12).

The confounding of general control expectancies with a variety of (affectively) negative perceptions of self may not be limited to the Rotter I-E Scale. Other control scales are highly related to measures of self-esteem. In a recent study by Moyal (1979) the Nowicki-Strickland Children's Locus of Control Scale and a measure of self-esteem (the Pier Harris Self-Concept Scale) were employed. These scales were highly correlated (r = .577), and the correlation between the control measure and the self-esteem measure exceeded the correlations between the control measure and designated criterion measures including measures of depression, and specific coping responses. Also, self-blame and uncontrollability may be confounded in some control scales. For example, Rothbaum and Wolfer (1979) suggested that the failure of a locus-of-control scale for negative outcomes to differentiate tendencies of children to employ "inward" (withdrawal) versus "outward" (aggressive) coping behaviors could have reflected a confounding of "self-blame" and "uncontrollability" within the scale.

In developing measures of control it may be desirable to exclude any items in which the content relates to self-esteem, self-blame, or

self-efficacy. Indeed the confounding of efficacy, self-blame, self-esteem, and control in many existing scales makes interpretation of relationships between existing control scales, coping responses, and other psychological indices difficult; however, several studies exist in which distinct scales for general control and for efficacy were utilized. The results of these studies suggest the potential utility of the control/efficacy distinction for prediction of coping responses.

Utility of the Control/Efficacy Distinction for the Prediction of Coping Responses

Research focusing on minority groups and women has suggested circumstances under which the recognition of external constraints (as distinct from estimates of personal efficacy) might be associated with potentially adaptive coping responses. Several of these studies used scales derived from factor analyses of the Rotter I-E Scale. Gurin, Gurin, Lao and Beattie (1969) factor analyzed the scale and identified two factors labeled "personal control" and "control ideology." The items of the "personal control" factor were stated in the first person singular, while the majority of the "control ideology" items were stated impersonally and dealt with control in broad contexts such as political and world affairs. These investigators identified the "personal control" factor with perceptions of personal efficacy and the "control ideology" factors with expectations of control in general (Gurin et al., 1969), in accord with the thinking which is represented in the present investigation.

In a sample of black college students, "internal" scores on the "personal control" scale were associated with superior performance on achievement tests while "internal" scores on the scale of "control

ideology" were associated with inferior achievement performance. However, high "external" scores on "control ideology" were associated with social activism, participation in civil rights movements, and aspirations to non-traditional black jobs (Gurin et al., 1969). Personal control (efficacy) scores did not differentiate activists from non-activists. The results regarding political activism were replicated by Abramowitz (1973).

Sanger and Alker (1972) identified similar factors that were labeled "personal control" and "Protestant work ethic." Active feminists were more external on the latter factor than were females not active in the feminist movement. Again, the "personal control" scores failed to differentiate activists from nonactivists. Along similar lines, Levenson (1975) defined three types of control scales--internal, powerful others, and chance. The latter two scales (considered to be external scales) were not significantly correlated with the internal scale, and three distinct factors corresponding to the three *a priori* scales emerged from a factor analysis. As predicted, high scores on the "powerful others" scale correlated with political activism scores for black male college students, and high chance scores were negatively correlated with a test of knowledge of current issues. The internal scale (that was similar in content to the "personal control" scales of the above studies) was unrelated to both dependent variables. The above studies suggest that, in some contexts, the recognition of external constraints on control may be associated with potentially effective coping behaviors such as taking collective, rather than individual, action to achieve goals directly subjected to systematic constraints. The studies of Gurin et al., (1979); Levenson, (1975); and Sanger and

Alker, (1972) suggest the potential utility of separate control and efficacy scales for predicting coping behavior.

Utility of Area Specific Scales

An additional refinement of control measurement involves the development of scales of control that are specific to the class of outcomes under investigation. There is a consensus that development of such area specific control scales may be justified (Rotter, 1966, 1975; Lefcourt, 1976). Although early attempts to develop area-specific control subscales were abandoned (Rotter, 1966), these attempts were based on samples of college students and centered on achievement, social and general world areas. Also, Peterson, Semmel, Melatsky, Abramson, Von Baeyer, and Seligman (Note 1) reported failure to develop differentiated achievement and affiliation subscales of an attributional style questionnaire. Again, a college student sample was used. These authors suggested that many middle class American college students might tend to view social situations as achievement oriented and tend not to differentiate social or affiliation contexts from achievement contexts. Possibly, with an older and more experienced population, satisfactory differentiation between important life areas such as intensely personal and more impersonal life roles would be obtained.[4]

Area-specific scales such as the Health Locus of Control Scale (Wallston, Wallston, Kaplan, and Maides, 1976) and the IAR, a children's achievement scale (Crandall, Katkovsky, and Crandall, 1975), have been

---

[4] In order for area specific subscales to be justified, it has been suggested that internal consistencies of the specific area subscales should be greater than the intercorrelations of the subscales (Rotter, 1966, 1975). Loo (1979) suggested that Cronbach's alpha for each subscale should exceed that for the composite.

used successfully to predict behavior in appropriate contexts. In a preliminary study, the Health LOC Scale was superior to the general Rotter I-E Scale in predicting health related behaviors (Wallston et al., 1976).

Asymmetries in Ascriptions for Positive and Negative Outcomes; Sexual Differences in Responses to Control Measures

Also of potential relevance for the development of control scales is the lack of symmetry of ascriptions for positive and negative outcomes that has been reported with some consistency (e.g., Falbo and Beck, 1979; Lefcourt, 1976; Luginbuhl, Crowe and Kahan, 1975; Nicholls, 1975; and Weiner and Kukla, 1970). Also, with children, the use of separate scales for positive and negative outcomes improved prediction of achievement behavior and specific coping styles (Crandall et al., 1965; DuCette and Soucar, 1972; Dweck and Reppucci, 1973; Mischel, Zeiss and Zeiss, 1974). Furthermore, males and females have shown different response patterns for scales of positive outcomes and for scales of negative outcomes (Crandall et al., 1965; Dweck and Reppucci, 1973; Weiner and Kukla, 1970).

Sex differences in response to control scales have been widely noted. Within the locus-of-control literature, the relation between scores on locus-of-control to outcomes, particularly achievement outcomes, has been found to be stronger for males (Crandall et al., 1965; Levenson, 1975; Phares, 1975; Platt, Pomeranz, Eiseman, and DeLisser, 1970). Also sex differences in attributions for success and failure have been noted within the literature generated by Weiner's attributional model (Luginbuhl et al., 1975; Weiner and Kukla, 1970). The nature of such sex differences has not always been consistent, and sex differences have

not been found in every case (Phares, 1975). Possibly, refinements in instruments used to assess control, such as the development of area-specific subscales covering life roles not touched upon by existing scales, and clear separation of efficacy and control assessments would be useful in evaluating the nature and extent of these gender differences. Clearly, gender is an important variable to consider when studying interrelationships between control estimates and coping.

Format of Control Scales

Originally, Rotter adopted a forced choice format for the I-E Scale primarily to attenuate socially desirable responding (Rotter, 1966). However, independent Likert-type control scales (Levenson, 1975), and control scales requiring a simple yes or no response (Nowicki and Duke, 1973; Wallston, et al., 1976) have been developed that show low and nonsignificant correlations with measures of socially desirable responding. Another method for controlling for socially desirable response set is the use of a measure of socially desirable responding scale as a covariate (Loo, 1979). Since other methods exist for controlling response sets, use of Likert-type or simple yes/no formats may be preferable to the forced-choice format because subjects report conflicts in responding to forced-choice format control scales (Sanger and Alker, 1972).

Implications of Cited Research for the Problem Under Investigation

Decisions for operationalization of the control and efficacy concepts were formulated on the basis of the theoretical models presented in Chapter I and the review of the literature on control instruments presented in this chapter. These guidelines and decisions are:

1. Considering the extent of gender differences in pattern of responses to control scales, I restricted the research to females.
2. I developed separate scales for each role since there was a general consensus that specific scales are superior to general scales in predicting specific area outcomes. Furthermore, existing control scales do not deal with outcomes in several of the targeted roles, and general control estimates may be confounded with other factors such as efficacy, self-blame or self-esteem in many existing scales.
3. Cited research suggested the utility of separate efficacy and control scales for predicting coping responses. In order to maximize the likelihood that control and efficacy would be distinguished, I used items for each scale that were logically distinct from the type of items used in the other scale. Efficacy items are usually stated in the first person singular. (For example, I can't control the outcome.) However, such statements do not necessarily distinguish between control and efficacy estimates. The model of Abramson et al., (1978) developed a concept of "personal helplessness" utilizing social comparisons. A relative efficacy concept using social comparisons would be logically distinct from a general control concept (i.e., an estimation of how much control people in general have over an outcome). For this reason, a relative efficacy concept based on "personal helplessness" (Abramson et al., 1978) was adopted. In order to heighten the distinction between efficacy and control, all control items were stated in third person plural.
4. It was decided that items for control and efficacy scales would focus on negative outcomes, problems, and role strains because the coping response scales drawn from Pearlin and Schooler (1978) focus on coping with problems and strains.

CHAPTER III

PILOT STUDY: DEVELOPMENT OF ROLE SPECIFIC EFFICACY AND CONTROL SCALES

Prior to the conduct of research designed to test the hypotheses developed in the first chapter, a pilot study was executed to develop a scale of general control estimates and a scale of relative efficacy estimates for each of the roles of marriage, parenting, economic management and occupation.

Development of Scale Items

Items developed for both control and efficacy scales focused on negative outcomes, problems, and strains specific to each role. Items developed for the efficacy scales stated comparisons of self's skills and capacities in the role to those of others (e.g., the average person at my income level, the average worker, my colleagues, other parents, my husband, other married people, my friends, etc.). Items developed for control scale involved statements that outcomes within the specific role are or are not controllable by people in general (e.g., the average person, most people, etc.).

All statements were rated on a seven point Likert-type scale indicating extent of agreement/disagreement with the item. Both positively and negatively stated items were included in each scale in

order to attenuate the impact of response acquiescence.[5]

Organization of the Questionnaire

A ten page questionnaire contained the control and efficacy items. The general control items (order randomized) appeared first in order to minimize the possibility that self would be used as a referent. Since it would have been difficult for subjects not engaged in a specific role to respond to efficacy items for that role, efficacy scales were administered as units, and the order of statements within each unit was randomized. The Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960) and the abbreviated version of the Beck Depression Inventory (Beck and Beck, 1972) were included in the pilot questionnaire.[6] The SD Scale was included to permit statistical control for socially desirable responding. The abbreviated Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) was included because both efficacy and general control have been theoretically related to depression (Abramson et al., 1978), and existing control scales are generally correlated with measures of depression (see Chapter II). Ratings of role importance for each of the four roles were obtained on seven point scales. The order of the role importance questions and the Crowne-Marlowe SDS was counterbalanced so that half of the subjects received the SDS before the efficacy scales and role importance questions after the efficacy scales while the other half of the subjects received the reverse order. A

---

[5] For the last portion of the preliminary study simplified synonyms were substituted for words in 12 of the 76 control and efficacy items. Synonyms were substituted for the following words: unsolvable, effective, remedy, eliminate, and relative.

[6] Further descriptions of the Crowne-Marlowe SDS and the abbreviated Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) are included in Appendix 2.

total of four orders (2 efficacy orders by 2 SDS/role importance orders) were distributed. The final page of the questionnaire contained questions regarding income, education, age, and miscellaneous questions relevant to engagement in the four roles of interest.

Stamped self-addressed envelopes and a letter of explanation were given to those who agreed to participate. All subjects were voluntary participants who agreed to complete the instrument anonymously and understood that the data would be used for dissertation purposes.

Sample

The final sample was comprised of 122 females between the ages of 22 and 64. Initially, 130 questionnaires were distributed to female volunteers at a crisis center (28), members of a business and professional women's organization (18), four church groups (44), employees in a state office building (17), residents of an apartment complex (12), and students and staff at a small university (11). Exactly 98 questionnaires (75%) were returned. Following minor changes in 12 items, 45 additional questionnaires were distributed to women of lower socioeconomic status. These questionnaires were distributed to sewing room employees in a tablecloth factory (17), aides in a nursing home (7), employees in a discount store and cooks in a small fast food restaurant (6), and employees and patrons of a Head Start Center (9). Additionally, 6 questionnaires were distributed to individuals personally known to the investigator. Of these, 24 questionnaires (53%) were returned. The sample of the pilot study was comprised of 122 subjects.

The mean age of the sample was 41.3 years (SD=11.2), and the mean family income category was 4.5 (SD=.2). (A category rating of 4.5 translates to a family income of $17,500 per year.) Approximately 34%

of the sample had an income of less than ten thousand dollars per year, and approximately 40% of the sample had an income of more than twenty-five thousand dollars per year. The mean number of years of education was 14.5 years (SD=3.5), and the range of years of education was 3 through 20. However, these figures may be overestimates of the average income and educational status of the sample since data for these variables were missing for approximately 33% of the questionnaires returned during the latter portion of the study in which women of the lower socioeconomic status were targeted. In contrast, only 3% of the data for these variables were missing for the initial group of returned questionnaires.

Approximately 76% of the women in the sample were employed; approximately 76% were married; and 81% had children under the age of 21.

Results

Item Analysis and Initial Internal Consistencies

Cronbach's alphas (Cronbach, 1951), scale means, and standard deviations were computed for all items in the initial pool of the items for each of the eight proposed scales (Table 1).[7] Additionally, internal consistencies, scale means, and standard deviations for the scale with each item omitted were computed. The correlation of each item with the SDS Scale was also computed for purposes of item analysis.

Internal consistencies for the eight initial scales ranged from

---

[7] Ratings for items stating low control or efficacy estimates were inverted prior to all analyses. For all scales, internal consistency estimates are based on responses of subjects actively engaged in the specific role.

TABLE 1

INTERNAL CONSISTENCIES FOR INITIAL CONTROL AND EFFICACY SCALES

	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items	Number of Cases[a]	Correlation with Crowne-Marlowe SDS
Control				
Parenting	.75	11	90	-.29**
Marriage	.69	10	85	-.15*
Occupation	.69	9	80	-.21**
Economics	.82	10	109	-.06
Efficacy				
Parenting	.92	9	90	-.40**
Marriage	.84	8	85	-.35**
Occupation	.87	9	80	-.43**
Economics	.92	8	109	-.17*

[a] Only cases for which no role data were missing are included.

*$p < .05$ (two-tailed)

**$p < .01$ (two-tailed)

.69 for the occupational control scale through .92 for the economics efficacy scale (Table 1). Generally, internal consistency estimates exceeding .80 are desirable; however, lower internal consistencies may be acceptable for basic as opposed to applied research (Nunnally, 1970). Each scale was, of necessity, relatively short (8 to 11 items), and the brevity of the scales might have contributed to low internal consistency values for several of the scales. However, the range of the internal consistencies for the reported scales compare favorably to those reported for existing control scales (Levenson, 1975; Reid and Ware, 1974; Rothbaum and Wolfer, 1978; Rotter, 1966; Wallston et al., 1976). Internal consistencies (i.e., Cronbach's alpha or K-R 20) in the range of .70 are typically reported for these scales. Rotter (1966) reported internal consistencies of approximately .70 for the widely used 23 item Rotter I-E Scale. Considering the maximum length of 11 items for the scales under development, the internal consistencies are in line with those reported for existing control scales of similar or longer length.

It was desirable to shorten the scales and to attenuate the correlation of each scale with the SDS. For these purposes, items were evaluated on the basis of changes in internal consistencies following removal of that item from the scale, changes in the mean and standard deviation of the scale following removal of that item, and the correlation of that item with the SDS. Items that were retained for each scale on the basis of these criteria are listed in the item key of Appendix 1.

Internal consistencies of the resultant scales are shown in Table 2. The range of internal consistencies for the abbreviated

TABLE 2

INTERNAL CONSISTENCIES FOR REVISED CONTROL AND EFFICACY SCALES

	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items	Number of Cases	Correlation with Crowne-Marlowe SDS
Control				
Parenting	.68	7	90	-.24**
Marriage	.71	8	85	-.11
Occupation	.68	8	80	-.20*
Economics	.79	7	109	.01
Combined	.87	30	109	-.17*
Efficacy				
Parenting	.84	5	90	-.32**
Marriage	.80	7	85	-.33**
Occupation	.77	5	80	-.36**
Economics	.88	5	109	-.12

*p < .05 (two-tailed)

**p < .01 (two-tailed)

scales (.68 through .88) is similar to the range of internal consistencies for the initial scales.

Evaluation of the Control/Efficacy Distinction Within Each Role

Internal consistencies for the control scales and for the efficacy scales were compared to the correlations between the scales. Although efficacy and control scales are significantly correlated within each role, internal consistency estimates (Cronbach's alphas) exceed, in all cases, the correlation between any two scales (Table 3). The highest correlation between an efficacy scale and a control scale occurs in the parenting role ($\underline{r} = .45$; $\underline{r}^2 = .20$).

A principal factor analysis, using a varimax rotation, (Harman, 1968; Nie, Hull, Jankins, Steinbrenner and Bent, 1970) supports the distinction between efficacy and control within each area. Tables 4-7 show (rotated) factor loadings on factors with eigenvalues greater than .9 for each role. The first factor in each role is always an efficacy factor while the second is a control factor. With the exception of the marital role, all efficacy items have loadings greater than .4 on the first factor, and only efficacy items have loadings greater than .4 on the first factor. Within the marital role (Table 4) one control item has a loading greater than .4 on the first factor while the two efficacy items involving comparisons of self to spouse show low loadings (< .21) on the first efficacy factor. Although efficacy estimates derived from self/other comparisons may be distinct from efficacy estimates derived from self-spouse comparisons, the two self/spouse items are retained because either source of efficacy should have similar implications and consequences for coping and role stress. Also,

TABLE 3

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCALES (PEARSON'S *r*) AND INTERNAL CONSISTENCIES (CRONBACH'S ALPHA) FOR SCALES

	Control				Efficacy			
	Parenting	Marriage	Occupation	Economics	Parenting	Marriage	Occupation	Economics
Control								
Parenting	.68[a]							
Marriage	.53	.71						
Occupation	.43	.40	.68					
Economics	.38	.45	.46	.79				
Efficacy								
Parenting	.45[b]	.35	.24	.25	.84			
Marriage	.23	.41	.33	.20	.57	.80		
Occupation	.33	.26	.34	.20	.40	.40	.77	
Economics	.31	.36	.21	.39	.47	.34	.33	.88

---

[a] Cronbach's alphas are in the diagonal.

[b] Correlations between efficacy and control scales within the same role are underlined.

TABLE 4

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF CONTROL AND EFFICACY ITEMS IN MARRIAGE

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	ME1	.78	MC6	.59	ME4	.68	MC7	.71
	ME2	.72	MC8	.57	ME6	.57	ME5	.47
	ME5	.64	MC1	.51	ME5	.44	ME6	.39
	ME6	.52	MC5	.45			MC4	.35
	ME7	.52	MC4	.33				
	MC8	.48						
	MC7	.32						
Eigenvalue	4.17		1.08		.78		.64	

NOTE: In all factor tables each control or efficacy item is designated with two letters and a number. The first letter is an abbreviation for the role name as follows: E (economics), O (occupation), P (parenting), M (marriage). The second letter is an abbreviation for the type of scale as follows: E (efficacy), C (control). The number designates the number of the item in the scale. All item designations correspond to those in the item key of Appendix 1.

In all factor tables, factor loadings are from a principal factor analysis after a varimax rotation. Only items with loadings greater than or equal to .3 are reported.

inclusion of the self/spouse items in the marriage efficacy scale attenuates the correlation between the scale and the SDS while raising the mean for the marriage efficacy scale.

For each role, only control items have loadings greater than .4 on the second factor. Within the parenting role (Table 6) and the economic role (Table 7), a third control factor emerges but each factor has an eigenvalue less than .9. There is an additional control factor and an additional mixed factor in occupation (Table 5), and an additional mixed factor and an additional efficacy factor in marriage. The minor third and fourth factors in all roles appear to reflect general response biases (e.g., response acquiescence). (None of these additional factors account for more than 13% of the total common variance.)

These analyses generally support the distinction between control and efficacy estimates. While control and efficacy may have a common source of variance--possibly an undifferentiated negative or positive view of world and self--the operational definitions of these concepts appear to be sufficiently distinct for use in research.

Control Distinctions Among Roles

Internal consistencies for the control scales were compared to the correlations between the four role scales (Table 3). All internal consistency estimates exceed intercorrelations among the role-specific control scales. However, some correlations between control scales for different roles are modestly high. Particularly, the correlation between the control scales for the two intensely personal roles (marriage and parenting) is high ($\underline{r} = .53$; $\underline{r}^2 = .28$).

A principal factor analysis using a varimax rotation was conducted on the pool of control items in an attempt to confirm a role

TABLE 5

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF CONTROL AND EFFICACY ITEMS IN OCCUPATION

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	OE3	.80	OC2	.66	OE4	.60	OC8	.54
	OE5	.69	OC7	.51	OC8	.54	OC5	.53
	OE2	.60	OC4	.49	OC1	.41	OC3	.37
	OE1	.55	OC8	.32				
	OE4	.46	OC6	.30				
Eigenvalue	3.05		1.24		.67		.38	

TABLE 6

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF CONTROL AND EFFICACY ITEMS IN PARENTING

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	PE4	.83	PC4	.65	PC7	.51
	PE1	.80	PC2	.54	PC3	.50
	PE2	.64	PC5	.46	PC6	.44
	PE5	.62	PE3	.30	PC2	.36
	PE3	.50	PC1	.30	PC1	.30
Eigenvalue	3.46		.94		.60	

TABLE 7

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF CONTROL AND EFFICACY ITEMS IN ECONOMICS

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	EE4	.87	EC4	.87	EC7	.54
	EE3	.82	EC5	.62	EC6	.53
	EE2	.74	EC1	.58	EC2	.37
	EE1	.69	EC3	.51		
	EE5	.65	EC2	.43		
Eigenvalue	4.07		1.57		.78	

TABLE 8

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF CONTROL ITEMS

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4		Factor 5	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	EC4	.73	MC4	.60	OC4	.59	PC2	.66	EC3	.78
	EC5	.72	PC6	.48	OC7	.53	PC4	.48	EC2	.47
	EC1	.62	MC3	.47	PC5	.48	PC5	.44	PC6	.35
	OC5	.35	MC1	.41	PC1	.40	PC1	.43		
	OC6	.33	MC8	.41	PC3	.37				
			EC7	.40	OC6	.31				
			MC6	.39						
			PC3	.35						
			OC2	.32						
Eigenvalue	5.61		1.77		1.43		1.14		1.00	

NOTE: Only factors with eigenvalues greater than or equal to 1.0 are reported.

distinction regarding control. Generally, results suggest a tendency to differentiate control perceptions according to role. Table 8 shows factor loadings for five factors with eigenvalues exceeding .99. Items loading greater than .4 on the first factor are all economic items. Also the fifth factor is an economic factor on which all items with loadings greater than .4 are economic items. The second factor is primarily a marriage factor with five or six items with high loadings (>.4) belonging to the marital role. The third factor tends to reflect occupation although one of three items with high loadings (>.4) is a parenting item, and several other parental items load moderately on this factor. The fourth factor is primarily a parental factor with all four items loading greater than .4 coming from the parental role. Although analyses suggest some level of distinction among roles regarding perceptions of control over negative outcomes, it is not surprising to find moderately high correlations between several of the role specific control scales indicative of generalized control perceptions as well.

Efficacy Distinctions Among Roles

Internal consistencies of all efficacy scales exceed all correlations between pairs of role-specific efficacy scales (Table 3). The highest correlation between two role efficacy scales occurs between the marriage and parenting scales ($\underline{r} = .57$; $\underline{r}^2 = .32$). Since almost 66% of the subjects were not engaged in at least one of the four roles, the majority of the cases had data missing for at least one of the efficacy scales; therefore, no factor analysis was attempted on the pool of efficacy items.

Properties of Control and Efficacy Scales

Table 9 shows descriptive statistics for each of the control and efficacy scales. (Scores for each of the efficacy and control scales were calculated by adding item scores and dividing by the number of items in the scale. In keeping with conventions for scoring existing control scales, low scores are indicative of *high* control or efficacy estimates, and high scores are indicative of low control or efficacy estimates.) Several of the efficacy scales tend to be skewed toward low scores (indicative of high efficacy estimates). A similar tendency is noted for the Beck Depression Inventory (Table 9). (There were many low depression scores.) It would be expected that most individuals would neither be depressed nor view themselves as ineffective (as compared to others) within daily life roles; therefore, such distributions would be expected within a normal, functioning sample.

Socially Desirable Response Set

The Crowne-Marlowe SDS was included as an index of socially desirable responding. Five of the eight scales are related to SDS ($p < .05$; Table 2). For all efficacy scales, except the economic scale, the correlation with SDS accounts for between 10 and 14 percent of the variance. In economics and marriage, the correlation between the control scale and SDS is low and accounts for less than one percent of the variance. The correlation between SDS and the composite control scale (i.e., the combination of all role specific control scales) is -.17 ($p < .05$). This correlation is similar in magnitude to correlations reported between the Rotter I-E Scale and SDS (Rotter, 1966). Because SDS is significantly correlated with several of the

TABLE 9

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR SCALES IN THE PILOT STUDY

	M	SD	Range	N[a]
Control				
Occupation	3.35	.95	1.0 - 5.8	91
Economics	2.89	1.07	1.0 - 6.5	120
Parenting	2.97	.95	1.0 - 5.6	96
Marriage	2.56	.91	1.0 - 5.5	91
Efficacy				
Occupation	2.58	1.28	1.0 - 6.4	91
Economics	2.57	1.37	1.0 - 6.4	120
Parenting	2.38	1.20	1.0 - 5.2	96
Marriage	2.18	.94	1.0 - 5.6	91
Crowne-Marlowe SDS	16.42	6.25	3.0 - 30.0	118
Beck Depression Inventory	3.35	4.01	0.0 - 23.0	120
Role Depression				
Occupation	5.86	1.44	1.0 - 7.0	92
Economics	5.36	1.47	1.0 - 7.0	121
Parenting	6.52	.99	1.0 - 7.0	96
Marriage	6.34	1.21	2.0 - 7.0	92

---

[a] Statistics for role scales are based on all cases for which at least 66% of the role specific data were complete.

efficacy and control scales in the pilot study, it is used as a covariate in subsequent research.

Exogenous Variables

The correlations between each role specific scale and the exogenous variables of age, income, and education are shown in Table 10. Income is the only exogenous variable that correlates significantly with any of the role specific scales. Income correlates significantly ($p < .10$) with all efficacy scales except the marriage scale, with the economic control scale, and with the composite control scale. Apparently low income is associated with estimates of low relative efficacy in most roles and, as might be expected, with low estimates of control in the economic management role.

Role Importance

Descriptive statistics for role importance ratings are shown in Table 9. The intensely personal roles of marriage and parenting have similar role importance ratings, t (80) = 1.79, $p > .05$.[9] On the other hand, for impersonal roles, the importance rating for occupation differs significantly from that for economics, t (90) = 3.05, $p < .05$. Also, ratings for impersonal roles differs from ratings for personal roles, t (64) = 4.1, $p < .05$.

Order Effects

Order effects were evaluated in regard to the four role efficacy and the four role control scales. The effects of the four orders (described previously) were assessed using analysis of variance, and

---

[9] A two-tailed test was employed.

TABLE 10

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ROLE SCALES AND EXOGENOUS VARIABLES

	Income	Age	Education	
	r	r	r	N
Control				
Economics	-.185*	-.096	.073	118
Parenting	-.037	-.103	-.077	96
Occupation	-.060	-.024	-.104	88
Marriage	.038	-.046	.154	88
Composite	-.140	-.087	-.001	118
Efficacy				
Economics	-.123*	.102	.008	118
Parenting	-.194*	-.021	-.008	96
Occupation	-.206*	-.152	-.047	88
Marriage	.030	.110	.029	88
Composite	-.214**	.009	.000	118

*$p < .05$ (two-tailed)

**$p < .01$ (two-tailed)

no statistically significant order effects were found (Table 41 of Appendix 2).

Depression, Control, and Efficacy

Perceptions of control and relative efficacy have been hypothesized to be related to depression (Abramson et al., 1978), and most existing control instruments have been found to be correlated with depression (see Chapter II). For partial validation of the reported scales, correlations between control scales and depression, and between efficacy scales and depression were computed (Table 11). Correlations between depression and a composite scale for efficacy and a composite scale for control (constructed by adding all role-specific efficacy or control scores and dividing by the number of specific scores) were also computed. All efficacy scales, including the composite, are significantly correlated with depression (Table 11).[10] Also, the composite control score and control scores in marriage and economics are correlated with depression (Table 12).

Also, it was of interest to determine whether efficacy and control scales were independently related to depression. Partial correlations between each composite scale and BDI (controlling for SDS, exogenous variables and the other composite scale) were computed (Table 12). Only the composite efficacy score is independently related to the Beck Depression Inventory (Table 12). Overall, results suggest a consistent relationship between efficacy scales and depression. Although the composite control scale is correlated with depression,

---

[10] All reported correlations are partial correlations controlling for SDS.

TABLE 11

PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN EFFICACY SCALES, CONTROL SCALES AND THE BDI

	partial r[a]	N
Efficacy		
Parenting	.26**	90
Marriage	.33*	85
Occupation	.30**	80
Economics	.27**	109
Composite[b]	.33**	109
Control		
Parenting	.07	90
Marriage	.28**	85
Occupation	.16	80
Economics	.25**	109
Composite	.25**	109

[a] SDS is controlled.

[b] Composite scores include roles in which the subject was actively engaged.

**$p < .01$ (one-tailed)

TABLE 12

PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COMPOSITE CONTROL ESTIMATES, COMPOSITE EFFICACY ESTIMATES, AND DEPRESSION CONTROLLING FOR EXOGENOUS VARIABLES AND THE OTHER ESTIMATE

	partial *r*[a]	partial *r*[b]
Composite Control	.23**	.11
Composite Efficacy	.30**	.23**

NOTE: N = 109

[a] The partial correlation is between each composite and BDI controlling for exogenous variables (income, age, education, and SDS).

[b] The partial correlation is between each composite and BDI controlling for exogenous variables and the other composite.

$^{**}p < .01$ (one-tailed)

only the composite efficacy scale is independently related to depression. (Composite control and efficacy scores were also calculated using role importance ratings as weights for role specific scores. Correlations between weighted scales and depression were also calculated. Results of these analyses are presented in Appendix 2.)

Implications for Subsequent Research

Analyses conducted in the pilot study tend to support the distinction between control and efficacy in each role. I concluded that the magnitudes of internal consistency estimates for all role specific efficacy and control scales are high enough to justify use of the scales in further research.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY, DATA COLLECTION, PROPERTIES OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS, AND STATEMENT OF SPECIFIC HYPOTHESES

The purpose of the following research is to test the general hypotheses listed in Chapter I. Detailed statements of specific hypotheses are given following analysis of the instruments used to operationally define key variables in the hypotheses.

Key Variables

Definitions of key variables for each role (marriage, parenting, occupation, and economic management) are:

1. Control estimates: The role-specific control scale developed in the pilot study defines control estimates for each role.

2. Efficacy estimates: The role-specific efficacy scale developed in the pilot study defines efficacy estimates for each role.

3. Passive coping responses: Items comprising the two passively oriented factors (i.e., items loading greater than .4 on the factors) from Pearlin and Schooler's 1978 study define passive coping in each role. (The two factors for each role are listed on page 11.)

4. Active coping responses: Items comprising the "discipline" factor in parenting; items comprising the "negotiation" factor in marriage; and items comprising the "optimistic action" factor in occupation (Pearlin and Schooler, 1978) define active coping in the

respective roles.

5. Subjective Stress: A role-specific adjective checklist (Pearlin and Schooler, 1978) defines subjective stress in each role.

Exogenous Variables and Perceived Strain

Relationships observed between either estimate (i.e., control or efficacy) and criterion variables (coping modes or subjective stress) could be spurious, resulting from joint associations with exogenous variables such as income, education, age, or socially desirable response set. Results from the pilot study indicated that control and efficacy estimates in several roles tend to be correlated with socially desirable response set and income. Therefore, in testing hypothesized relationships between estimates and criterion variables, the following exogenous variables serve as covariates:

1. Socially Desirable Response Set: The Crowne-Marlowe SDS is used as a measure of socially desirable responding. (Additional information about the SDS is given in Appendix 2).

2. Other Exogenous Variables: Income, education, and age are used as covariates. (Questions regarding these variables appear on the final page of the questionnaire which is reproduced in Appendix 5.)

3. Occupational Status: I used Duncan's Index (Appendix 3) to code occupational status.

Mode of coping, levels of subjective stress, and estimates of control and personal efficacy could vary with the perceived intensity of environmental strain. An estimate of role strain is used as a covariate in order to ascertain whether an observed relationship respective roles.

[illegible]

The Relationship [illegible] Perception

[illegible]

Appendix [illegible]

[illegible]

between each estimate and a criterion variable is independent of overall intensity of perceived problems and strains occurring within that particular role.[11]

Pearlin and Schooler (1978) developed strain items for each role. Items reported by Pearlin and Schooler (1978) to load greater than .7 on any strain factor comprise the role strain measure in each role.

An item key (Appendix 1) lists all items comprising efficacy scales, control scales, coping scales, stress scales, and strain scales by scale designation.

Final Questionnaire

Key instruments described above comprised the final questionnaire which was six pages long (back and front) and self-administered. (The final questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix 5). The Rotter I-E Scale was attached to alternate questionnaires.

As in the pilot study, the control items appeared first. The order of the 30 items from the control scales was randomized. A unit (one page, back and front) for each role followed the control items. The role unit consisted of the role efficacy scale, role strain scale, role coping scale, and the role stress adjectives list.[12] Item orders

---

[11] Variance shared among self-report scales such as those for efficacy, control, strain, coping, and subjective stress could represent generalized positive or negative world views and other response biases.

[12] Efficacy, strain, coping, and stress items for each role were administered as a unit because these items dealt with ongoing experiences in the specific role and only subjects actively engaged in the role could respond to such items; therefore, administration of all such items as a unit permitted subjects not engaged in the role to skip the entire unit.

were randomized within each specific scale, and the order of the four role units was randomized within the questionnaire. The Rosenberg Scale, SDS, socioeconomic, and demographic questions comprised the final page. Items comprising key scales required a response on a seven item scale. Efficacy, control, strain, and coping items involved scales assessing either agreement/disagreement or frequency (never/ often). (Three economic items required different response alternatives involving money left over at the end of the month, extent of money problems, and improvement/decline of standard of living.) Stress items consisted of adjectives to be rated on a seven point scale.

Sample

The sample included women actively engaged in at least two of the four roles of marriage, parenting, occupation and economic management. Therefore, young college students who were unlikely to be engaged in these roles and women over age 65 were not included in the sample. In order to ensure a return of at least 200 questionnaires, a total of 383 questionnaires was distributed.[13] A sample containing a variety of socioeconomic, educational, and occupational statuses was desired. In order to ensure such broad representation questionnaires were distributed to diverse groups and types of women. A total of 262 questionnaires was distributed to employees of a state university, a nursing home, a state hospital, small businesses, several public and private schools, and a public library; and to members of a book club, a chapter of the National Organization of Women, four church groups,

---

[13] Letters of explanation were attached to each questionnaire and questionnaires were returned anonymously in a self-addressed envelope.

and a professional women's club. Of these 262 questionnaires, 172 (66%) were returned. In order to ensure representation from lower socioeconomic groups, 121 questionnaires were also distributed to patrons of a poverty agency, employees in sewing rooms of a clothing factory, aides in a nursing institution, and service employees in a public school. However, only 36 questionnaires (30%) of those distributed to predominantly low socioeconomic groups were returned. (It was not possible to issue reminders to patrons of the poverty agency since they were not required to give their name, and many did not have regular contact with the agency.) The overall return rate was 54% (208 questionnaires). Six questionnaires were not used because less than 30% of the questionnaire was completed or because the respondent was under the age of 21 and was not engaged in any of the targeted roles.

The mean age of the current sample (36.6) was lower than that of the pilot sample (41.3 years). However, the mean family income category (4.5) is identical for the two samples, and the mean number of years of education for the second sample (14.7) is similar to that of the pilot sample (14.5). Socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the sample and the initial pilot sample are shown in Table 25. While only 76% of the women in the pilot sample were employed, 89% of the women in the second sample were employed. On the other hand, only 60% of the women in the second sample had children while 80% had children in the pilot study. Only 61 women (30%) in the second study had children younger than age 21. In the pilot sample 76% of the respondents were married, and in the second sample, 78% of the respondents were married. Therefore, the second sample differed from the

first sample mainly in that respondents were younger in the second sample and were more likely to be employed but less likely to have children than those in the pilot study. Although many types of women are represented in it, the sample is not representative of any particular population. The fact that the sample does not represent any specific population, and the fact that the sample includes only women limit generalization of conclusions.

Psychometric Properties of Control and Efficacy Scales

As in the pilot study a principal factor analysis with a varimax rotation was conducted for each role area on the pool of efficacy and control items. As in the pilot study, a distinction between efficacy and control is supported within each of the role areas. As in the pilot study, minor factors reflect response acquiescence in each role. Loadings from factor analyses are reported in Tables 13-16. Also in these tables, factor loadings from the pilot study are shown for similar factors. Table 17 shows internal consistencies for control and efficacy scales in each role as well as intercorrelations among the scales.

Economics: Control and Efficacy Distinction

In Table 13, factor loadings within the economic area are shown. All five efficacy items load on the first factor and the pattern of loadings on the first factor are similar to that of the pilot study. Only control items load on factor two, and again the pattern of loadings are similar to that of the pilot study with the same items loading on the second factor in both studies. Similarly,

TABLE 13

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF CONTROL AND EFFICACY ITEMS IN ECONOMICS

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	EE4	.87 (.87)[a]	EC4	.75 (.87)	EC7	.85 (.54)
	EE3	.82 (.82)	EC2	.72 (.43)	EC6	.83 (.53)
	EE2	.82 (.74)	EC5	.72 (.62)		
	EE5	.80 (.65)	EC3	.70 (.51)		
	EE1	.78 (.69)	EC1	.63 (.58)		
Eigenvalue	4.57		1.99		1.28	

NOTE: A varimax rotation was used for all factor analyses. Only factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 are reported in factor tables, and only items loading greater than .3 are reported for each factor.

[a] For purposes of comparison, loadings from similar factors from the pilot study are given in parenthesis.

items with the highest loadings on the third factor are control items. Again the two items with the highest loadings on the third factor are the same items exhibiting the highest loadings on the third economic factor in the pilot study. The internal consistency estimates (Cronbach's alphas) for the economics control and efficacy scales are high (.799 and .866 respectively) and exceed the correlations of the scales with other scales (Table 17).

Occupation: Control and Efficacy Distinction

While the control/efficacy distinction is supported by the factor analysis of occupational items, the pattern departs from that found within other areas and within the occupational role in the pilot study.

The primary factor is a control factor with six of eight control items loading greater than .30 on the first factor while the second factor is an efficacy factor. A third factor is another control factor (Table 14). Factor 1 from the pilot study is similar to factor 2 of the second study, while the second factor of the pilot study and the third factor of the second study are similar. Although the factor patterns emerging from the two studies show some discrepancies, the factor analyses do support the primary theoretical distinction between efficacy and control. Internal consistency estimates for the occupational control scales are acceptable (.78 and .73, respectively) and exceed all correlations between scales (Table 17).

Marriage: Control and Efficacy Distinction

In the marriage domain, a primary efficacy factor and a

TABLE 14

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF CONTROL AND EFFICACY ITEMS IN OCCUPATION

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	OC6	.79	OE4	.80(.46;F1)[a]	OC4	.76(.49;F2)	OE1	.65
	OC5	.79	OE5	.80(.69;F1)	OC2	.74(.66;F2)	OE2	.58
	OC8	.71	OE3	.77(.80;F1)	OC3	.65(.23;F2)	EC7	.56
	OC1	.61	OE2	.44(.60;F1)	OC7	.31(.49;F2)		
	OC7	.40						
	OC3	.34						
Eigenvalue	3.49		2.25		1.33		1.07	

[a] For purposes of comparison, item loadings for similar factors from the pilot study are given in parenthesis.

secondary control factor emerged. As can be seen from Table 15, the primary and secondary factors are similar to corresponding factors from the pilot study in that items with highest loadings on corresponding factors are the same for both studies. A third factor apparently associated with response acquiescence emerged, and both efficacy and control items load on this factor. Two efficacy items dealing specifically with spouse/self comparisons load highly on a fourth factor. A distinction between efficacy derived from spouse/self comparisons, and efficacy derived from general others/self comparisons was also suggested in the pilot study. However, efficacy estimates derived from either source should show similar relationships to the theoretically interesting variables of self-esteem, coping, and subjective stress. Therefore, for purposes of the current study, I retained the self/spouse items in the efficacy scale. Internal consistencies of marital control and efficacy scales are acceptable (.756 and .781 respectively) and exceed correlations of the scales with the other role efficacy and control scales (Table 17).

Parenting: Control and Efficacy Distinction

As in the pilot study, a primary efficacy factor emerged (Table 16). Although items with the highest loadings on the second control factor are all control items, two efficacy items load moderately (.45) on the second factor. Three control items also load on a third factor. Furthermore, the internal consistency estimate for the parental control scale is low (.62) although the internal consistency estimate for the efficacy scale is acceptable (.799).

Because the parental control scale's consistency is low and the

TABLE 15

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF CONTROL AND EFFICACY ITEMS IN MARRIAGE

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	ME1	.85 (.78)[a]	MC8	.77 (.57)	MC4	.69	ME3	.80
	ME6	.83 (.52)	MC1	.68 (.51)	MC3	.60	ME4	.67
	ME2	.79 (.72)	MC6	.66 (.59)	MC7	.64	MC2	-.33
	ME5	.75 (.64)	MC5	.62 (.45)	MC2	.54		
	ME7	.68 (.52)	MC4	.60 (.33)	ME5	.45		
						.40		
Eigenvalue	4.87		1.81		1.47		1.24	

[a] For purposes of comparison, item loadings for similar factors from the pilot study are given in parenthesis.

TABLE 16

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF CONTROL AND EFFICACY ITEMS IN PARENTING

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	PE4	.62 (.83)[a]	PC3	.73 (.50; F3)	PC2	.81 (.54; F2)
	PE1	.73 (.80)	PC7	.64 (.51; F3)	PC1	.76 (.30; F2)
	PE3	.67 (.50)	PC5	.59 (.27; F3)	PC4	.58 (.65; F2)
	PE2	.73 (.64)	PC6	.47 (.44; F3)		
	PE5	.58 (.62)	PE5	.45 (.25; F3)		
			PE4	.45 (-.11; F3)		
Eigenvalue	3.09		1.66		1.45	

[a] For purposes of comparison, item loadings for similar factors from the pilot study are given in parenthesis.

TABLE 17

INTERNAL CONSISTENCIES (CRONBACH'S ALPHA) FOR EFFICACY AND CONTROL SCALES, AND CORRELATIONS (PEARSON'S r) BETWEEN SCALES

	Control				Efficacy				Composites	
	Marriage	Parenting	Occupation	Economics	Marriage	Parenting	Occupation	Economics	Personal	All Roles
Control										
Marriage	.756[a]									
Parenting	.525	.621								
Occupation	.387	.378	.780							
Economics	.378	.244	.304	.799						
Efficacy										
Marriage	.429	.236	.194	.250	.781					
Parenting	.206	.358	.200	.200	.373	.799				
Occupation	.201	.161	.222	.255	.424	.302	.731			
Economics	.241	.167	.154	.401	.438	.379	.341	.866		
Composite Control										
Personal (Marriage, Parenting)									.781	
All Roles										.864

---

[a] Cronbach's alphas are in the diagonal. The number of cases used for calculation of alphas for each scale equals Ns for each scale given in Table 14.

correlation between the marital control scale and the parental control scale is moderately high (.525), all analyses in the parental role were repeated using a combined personal role control scale (alpha = .781), consisting of all marriage and parenting items. Any differences between the analyses using the parental control scale and parallel analyses using the combined interpersonal role scale are treated in the discussion of the results.

Perceptions of General Control: Distinctions Among Roles

Of secondary interest is whether perceived control is distinct for specific roles. As in the pilot study, a principal factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted on the pool of control items (Table 18). As in the pilot study factors suggest role distinction regarding control estimates. All economic control items load on the first factor; marriage and parenting items load on the second factor; and occupation items load on the third factor. Minor factors include (1) a mixed economic and marriage factor, (2) a parenting factor, and (3) a mixed economic and parenting factor. However, these minor factors account for less than 15% of the total common variance and seem to be associated with response acquiescence. A consistency is found between the first factor from both the pilot study and the final study in that the three items with highest loadings are the same for both studies. The second and third factors are consistent across studies in that items from the same areas load on corresponding factors. However, the specific items from these roles that load on corresponding factors are not identical. In summary, however, the analyses from both studies support a distinction regarding control among economic,

TABLE 18

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF ALL CONTROL ITEMS

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4		Factor 5		Factor 6	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	EC4	.80 (.73)[a]	MC1	.71	OC3	.68	EC7	.73	PC3	.81	PC4	.78
	EC5	.75 (.72)	MC8	.66	OC1	.67	EC6	.65	PC5	.68	EC3	.52
	EC1	.67 (.62)	MC6	.62	OC6	.61	MC4	.62	PC7	.39	PC7	.49
	EC2	.65 (.27)	MC5	.58	OC2	.58	MC2	.51				
	EC3	.54 (.29)	PC2	.50	OC4	.58	MC3	.51				
	EC6	.40 (.18)	PC1	.46	OC8	.55	MC7	.39				
	EC7	.35 (.21)	MC4	.43	OC5	.52	MC6	.35				
			MC7	.41								
Eigenvalue	6.21		3.04		2.18		2.06		1.45		1.22	

[a] For comparisons, item loadings from the pilot study are included in parenthesis.

interpersonal and occupational roles.

Psychometric Properties of Coping Response Scales

Within each role the pool of active and passive coping items was subjected to a principal factor analysis.[14] Of primary interest is the fact that there emerged confirmation of the distinction between active and passive coping responses sufficient to justify utilization of the distinction in subsequent research.

Of secondary interest was replication of factors defined in Pearlin and Schooler's study (1978). Results of these analyses (with corresponding loadings from the latter study) are shown in Tables 19 through 22. Internal consistency estimates and scale intercorrelations for all coping scales are presented in Table 23.

Coping Response in Economics

The two economic factors emerging from the analysis show a high degree of correspondence to those obtained from the Pearlin and Schooler study (Table 19). The first factor is similar to the "selective ignoring" factor of the earlier study and the second factor corresponds to the "optimistic faith" factor of the earlier study. Since no active response was defined in economics, this analysis does not permit a connection with the active/passive distinction. The two passive responses in economics were combined to form a single (passive) coping measure within the economic management role. The internal consistency estimate for the resultant scale is .64 which exceeds all

---

[14] Items belonging to each passive and active coping response within each role are given in the item key (Appendix 1) along with the name of the response scale from Pearlin and Schooler's study.

TABLE 19

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF COPING RESPONSE ITEMS IN ECONOMICS

	Factor 1		Factor 2	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	EPas3	.82 (.64; S.I.)	EPas6	.76 (.71; O.F.)
	EPas4	.82 (.69; S.I.)	EPas5	.62 (.58; O.F.)
	EPas1	.62 (.67; S.I.)	EPas2	.48 (.48; O.F.)
	EPas2	.54 (.42; S.I.)		
Eigenvalue		2.18		1.07

NOTE: Item designations correspond to those found in the item key (Appendix 1). The first letter of the designation is the first letter of the role name, and the remaining letters designate the item as passive (Pas) or active (Act).

In all factor analyses of coping response items, loadings from the component analysis of Pearlin and Schooler (1978) are given in parenthesis along with the abbreviated name of their factor. In this table S.I. represents "selective ignoring" and O.F. represents "optimistic faith."

correlations between the economic coping scale and other coping response scales (Table 23).

Coping Responses in Occupation

In the occupational role, two passive response modes ("selective ignoring" and "substitution of rewards") and one active response ("optimistic action") were delineated by Pearlin and Schooler's analysis. As shown in Table 20, three items with the highest loadings on the first factor are "selective ignoring" items, although one "substitution of rewards" item loads moderately on the first factor. Items with high loadings on the third factor are all "substitution of rewards" items. The second factor shows correspondence to the active "optimistic action" factor; however, a bipolar type of dimension is suggested with active items loading negatively and a passive item (OPas from "substitution of rewards") loading positively on the second factor. This analysis presents support for the active/passive distinction but suggests the possibility of a bipolar active/passive dimension.

In occupation, the two passive responses were combined to form a single occupational passive coping scale. One item (OPas 2) does not load on any factor and inclusion of that item significantly diminishes the internal consistency estimate for the passive coping scale. Therefore, this item was omitted from the scale. The internal consistency estimate for the resultant scale is .68 which exceeds the correlations between the occupational passive coping scale and other coping scales (Table 23).

One active item (OAct 3) does not load on any factor including

TABLE 20

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF COPING RESPONSE ITEMS IN OCCUPATION

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	OPas4	.82 (.52; S.I.)	OPas7	.57 (.56; S.R.)	OPas5	.80 (.69; S.R.)
	OPas3	.69 (.72; S.I.)	OAct2	-.70 (.73; O.A.)	OPas8	.77 (.68; S.R.)
	OPas1	.69 (.77; S.I.)	OAct1	-.61 (.73; O.A.)	OPas6	.38 (.58; S.R.)
	OPas7	.31 (.56; S.R.)				
Eigenvalue		2.91		1.98		1.22

NOTE: Abbreviations for Pearlin and Schooler's factor names (in parenthesis) are: S.I. ("selective ignoring"); S.R. ("substitution of rewards"); and O.A. ("optimistic action").

the active coping factor. Indeed, the content of the item does not suggest action. It was, therefore, deleted from the active scale.[15] The internal consistency of the resultant scale is .64, which is low. However, the internal consistency estimate exceeds the correlation of the scale with other coping scales (Table 23). Still the passive and active coping response scales in occupation do exhibit a modest negative correlation (-.30) which suggests these responses are not orthogonal and indeed, that one mode of coping tends to exclude the other.

Coping Responses in Parenting

Two passive response modes ("resignation" and "selective ignoring") and one active response mode ("discipline") were delineated by Pearlin and Schooler (1978)

In the current study, four factors emerged in the parenting area (Table 21). The first factor corresponds to the "selective ignoring" factor, while the second factor generally corresponds to the "discipline" factor; although, as in occupation, some bipolarity is suggested since one passive item exhibits a modest negative loading on this factor. The third factor also exhibits a bipolarity of a similar nature, and the fourth factor involves items from the "selective ignoring" factor. The two items unique to "resignation" did not show high loadings on any of the factors.

To obtain a single passive response scale in parenting, the

---

[15] For both active and passive coping scales in occupation, the omission of the item from each scale did not affect subsequent results. Subsequent analyses were conducted for both scales with the item included and the item excluded. No differences in results were found.

TABLE 21

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF COPING RESPONSE ITEMS IN PARENTING

	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	PPas6	.74 (.66; S.I.)	PAct3	.78 (.83; D.)	PPas2	.83 (.53; S.I.)	PPas7	.83 (.56; S.I.)
	PPas4	.69 (.62; S.I.)	PAct2	.73 (.83; D.)	PPas3	.67 (.56; S.I.)	PPas4	.68 (.62; S.I.)
	PPas1	.67 (.63; S.I.)	PAct1	.64 (.85; D.)	PAct1	-.39 (.85; D.)		
	PPas6	.44 (.56; S.I.)	PPas7	-.31 (.56; S.I.)				
	PPas7	.33 (.56; S.I.)						
Eigenvalue		2.46		1.80		1.36		1.20

NOTE: Abbreviations for Pearlin and Schooler's factor names are: S.I. ("selective ignoring"); D. ("discipline").

two passive responses were combined. The internal consistency of the resultant scale is somewhat low (.65). The internal consistency for the brief "discipline" response scale corresponding to factor 2 is also low (.60). However, the internal consistencies of both active and passive scales exceed the correlations of the scales with other coping scales, and the scales are not correlated.

Coping Responses in Marriage

Two passive responses ("forebearance" and "selective ignoring") and one active response ("negotiation") were delineated by Pearlin and Schooler (1978) in marriage. However, the current analysis does not support the distinction made by Pearlin and Schooler in the marital domain. Rather, the first factor emerging from the analysis suggests a single active/passive bipolar dimension with all active items loading inversely on the dimension and passive items loading directly on the dimension (Table 22). Items loading on the second factor are generally items containing positive adjectives ("good" and "fair"). Subjects tended to agree with these items. The second factor, therefore, may reflect a tendency to agree with positively stated items.[16]

Considering the strong bipolar nature of the first factor, I inverted the active items and formed a single active/passive scale in the marital domain. (Indeed, a strong negative correlation (-.44) is exhibited between the sum of the active items and the sum of the passive items.) The resultant scale exhibits a satisfactory internal

---

[16] Omission of items loading strongly on the second factor did not materially alter the internal consistency of the scale, nor alter results of subsequent regression analyses. Results reported in subsequent analyses are based on a scale containing all of the original pool of items.

TABLE 22

A PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS OF COPING RESPONSE ITEMS IN MARRIAGE

	Factor 1		Factor 2	
	Item	Loading	Item	Loading
	MPas2	.72 (.52; S.I.)	MPas4	.86 (.63; S.I.)
	MPas8	.70 (.51; F.)	MPas5	.80 (.63; S.I.)
	MPas3	.64 (.57; S.I.)	MPas7	.57 (.67; F.)
	MPas6	.63 (.67; F.)	MAct1	.48 (.78; N.)
	MPas1	.49 (.77; F.)		
	MPas7	.40 (.67; F.)		
	MAct2	-.32 (.78; N.)		
	MAct1	-.68 (.68; N.)		
Eigenvalue		3.14		2.07

NOTE: Factor name abbreviations are: S.I. ("selective ignoring"); F. ("forebearance"); N. ("negotiation").

TABLE 23

INTERNAL CONSISTENCIES (CRONBACH'S ALPHA) OF COPING SCALES AND CORRELATIONS (PEARSON'S r) BETWEEN SCALES

	Passive Response Modes				Active Response Modes	
	Marriage	Parenting	Occupation	Economics	Parenting	Occupation
Passive Response Modes						
Marriage (Active/ Passive)	.732[a]					
Parenting	.169	.651				
Occupation	.361	.182	.679			
Economics	.153	.142	.160	.638		
Active Response Modes						
Parenting	-.091	-.063	.039	.072	.601	
Occupation	.064	.099	-.303	.082	.028	.637

[a] Cronbach's alphas are in the diagonal. The number of cases used to estimate internal consistencies for each coping scale corresponds to Ns in Table 13.

consistency (.73) which is higher than the correlation between the marriage coping scale and other area coping scales (Table 13).

Subjective Stress Scales

Table 24 shows internal consistencies for each role specific subjective stress scale. Internal consistency estimates for the stress scales are high, ranging from .87 to .95 and, in all cases, exceed correlations among the stress scales. The economic management stress scale is moderately correlated with stress scales in other roles (Table 24). For each role, a single major factor emerged from a principal factor analysis conducted on the pool of subjective stress items.

Self-Esteem Scale

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale defines self-esteem, and the internal consistency estimate (alpha) for this scale is .84 in the current study.

Description of Responses to Key Scales

Control and Efficacy Scales

In keeping with scoring of extant control scales, high scores on control scales denote low control estimates and high scores on efficacy scales denote low efficacy estimates. Means, standard deviations, standard errors and ranges for each of the four control scales and for each of the efficacy scales are given in Table 25, and corresponding statistics for each scale from the pilot study are given in parentheses. In marriage, parenting, and economics, mean control scores were higher in the final study than in the pilot study. However,

TABLE 24

INTERNAL CONSISTENCIES (CRONBACH'S ALPHA) OF STRESS SCALES AND CORRELATIONS (PEARSON'S *r*) BETWEEN STRESS SCALES

Stress	Marriage	Parenting	Occupation	Economics
Marriage	.947[a]			
Parenting	.281	.866		
Occupation	.233	.201	.918	
Economics	.432	.419	.428	.917

[a] Alphas are in the diagonal. *N*s for alphas correspond to those in Table 13.

TABLE 25

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR CONTROL AND EFFICACY SCALES

	M	SD	SE	Range	N
Control					
Marriage	2.65 (2.56)[a]	.99 (.91)	.07	1.0-5.8	201
Parenting	3.23 (2.97)	.95 (.95)	.07	1.0-5.8	197
Occupation	3.52 (3.35)	1.12 (.95)	.08	1.3-6.8	202
Economics	3.12 (2.89)	1.18 (1.07)	.08	1.0-7.0	202
Efficacy					
Marriage	2.20 (2.18)	.98 (.94)	.07	1.0-5.0	158
Parenting	2.48 (2.38)	1.20 (1.20)	.10	1.0-4.8	126
Occupation	2.39 (2.58)	1.03 (1.28)	.08	1.0-5.0	182
Economics	2.44 (2.57)	1.04 (1.37)	.09	1.0-6.8	196

---

[a] For purposes of comparison, means and standard deviations for subjects in the pilot study are given in parentheses.

in the two impersonal roles of economics and occupation, mean efficacy scores tended to be lower (denoting higher efficacy expectancies) in the final study.

In the pilot sample and in the final sample, the lowest mean control score is in the marital domain, and the highest mean control score is in the occupational role. Apparently, problems in the marital domain are viewed as the most amenable to control by people in general while problems encountered in occupation are viewed as least amenable to control by people in general. The distributions of control scores exhibit neither extreme kurtosis nor skewness.

Regarding efficacy, many subjects expressed strong confidence in their skills and abilities to solve problems relative to others. This positive view is particularly evident in the two intensely personal roles of marriage and parenting (as was the case in the pilot study.) In fact the range of efficacy scores is restricted in all roles except economics. Generally, there are no scores indicative of extremely low efficacy estimates (i.e., extremely high efficacy scores). There is some tendency for distributions of efficacy scores to be skewed toward lower ranges. The lack of extremely high efficacy scores in several roles suggests that higher scores obtained in these areas (denoting lower efficacy estimates) could best be interpreted as indicative of uncertainty about or a lack of strong confidence in one's own ability to handle problems rather than a strongly held conviction of low efficacy.

Coping Responses Scales

There was a general tendency for employment of active coping

responses to be reported more frequently than employment of passive response modes. In occupation, the distribution of active coping scores tends to be moderately skewed toward higher ranges of scores (denoting more frequent active coping). Only 6.6% of the sample scored below 2.5 (i.e., reported infrequent active coping) in occupation while approximately 40% of the sample scored above 5.5 on the active scale. Also, in parenting there is a tendency (by parents with children under 21) to report use of "discipline" when confronted with problems with children. Only 6.3% of women with children under 21 reported infrequent use of discipline (i.e., scored below 2.5) when confronted with role strain in parenting while 32% reported that they frequently used discipline (i.e., scored above 5.5). In marriage, the mean score on the active/passive coping scale is within the active range. Approximately 6% of the sample of married women scored above 5.5 on the scale (denoting passive as opposed to active coping).

Passive coping is reported less frequently in intensely personal as compared to impersonal roles (Table 26). Passive coping is most frequently reported in connection with problems encountered in the economic management role, and the mean passive coping score (4.63) in economics is within the higher range of scores. Generally, the distributions of passive scores are not extremely skewed toward high or low scores.

Subjective Stress Scores

Subjective stress scores are lowest in marriage, and highest in economics (Table 26). In both intensely personal roles (marriage and parenting) there is a modest tendency for the distribution of

TABLE 26

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR EXOGENOUS VARIABLES, STRAIN, STRESS, COPING, AND SELF-ESTEEM SCALES

	M	SD	SE_M	Range	N
Income (Category)	4.51 (4.53)[a]	1.62 (1.21)	.11	1.0- 6.0	188
Education (Years)	14.72 (14.51)	3.04 (3.49)	.21	4.0-20.0	194
Age	36.62 (41.30)	11.29 (11.21)	.83	21.0-64.0	188
Crowne-Marlowe SDS	16.65 (16.43)	5.88 (6.21)	.42	3.0-30.0	198
Occupation (Duncan's Score)	53.76	20.83	1.70	9.0-85.0	145
Self-Esteem (Rosenberg)	3.23	.47	.03	1.8- 4.0	197
Role Strain					
Marriage	3.06	1.40	.11	1.0- 6.7	159
Parenting	3.69	1.23	.11	1.0- 7.0	128
Occupation	2.84	1.07	.08	1.0- 5.8	182
Economics	3.64	1.37	.10	1.0- 7.0	198
Active Coping					
Parenting	4.65	1.32	.12	1.3- 7.0	128
Occupation	4.80	1.11	.08	1.0- 7.0	181
Passive Coping					
Marriage	3.49	.95	.09	1.0- 5.9	159
Parenting	3.37	.92	.08	1.0- 5.4	128
Occupation	3.65	.95	.07	1.2- 6.3	183
Economics	4.63	.95	.07	1.5- 6.5	195

TABLE 26-Continued

	M	*SD*	*SE*$_M$	Range	*N*
Stress					
Marriage	2.48	1.36	.11	1.0 - 7.0	157
Parenting	3.15	1.61	.11	1.0 - 6.7	126
Occupation	3.10	1.37	.10	1.0 - 7.0	181
Economics	3.57	.07	.10	1.0 - 6.0	193

[a] For purposes of comparison, the means and standard deviations for the pilot study subjects are given in parentheses beside the appropriate statistics for income, education, age, and SDS.

subjective stress scores to be skewed toward lower ranges (denoting lower levels of subjective stress). Only 5.1% of the married sample reported scores in higher ranges (i.e., greater than 5.5) in the marital domain, and approximately 8.7% of all mothers reported higher subjective stress scores in parenting. In occupation, approximately 10% of the employed sample reported intense subjective stress, and in the economic domain, approximately 20% of the sample reported subjective stress in higher ranges. It is interesting to note that the mean strain score is highest in economics and lowest in occupation (Table 26). High stress and strain scores in the area of economics suggests that economics is the most problematic role domain of the four domains for the sample.

Statement of Specific Hypotheses

The preceding description of characteristics of scales defining key variables provide the background necessary for further specification of hypotheses developed in Chapter I. Details of hypotheses to be tested are provided below. Specific hypotheses regarding either control estimates or efficacy estimates refer only to the independent contribution of each estimate (i.e., the contribution of the estimate after the other estimate has been taken into account). All hypotheses are directional hypotheses.[17]

Considering the ex post facto, correlational nature of the research, I do not state the hypotheses in causal terms. No conclusions about causal relationships among the variables can be justified.

---

[17] For hypotheses H_1 through H_{18} and H_{25}, the predicted sign of the partial coefficient for the relevant estimate should be the same as the sign of the zero-order correlation coefficient between the estimate and the dependent variable.

Hypotheses About Control Estimates, Efficacy Estimates, and Coping Response Modes

The general hypotheses from page 15 state that low control estimates and low efficacy estimates will both be independently related to high reported frequency of use of passive coping modes and to low reported frequency of use of active coping modes. Twelve specific hypotheses listed below are derived from the general hypotheses. Each of the below hypotheses posits that the net contribution of the role-specific estimate (either control or efficacy) to prediction of the specified coping response mode will be significant. "Net contribution" refers to the contribution of the specified estimate to the total variance over and above (a) exogenous variables--i.e., age, income, education, and (in occupation only) occupational status, (b) socially desirable response set, (c) the other estimate (either control or efficacy), and (d) role specific strain. The sign of the coefficient for the estimate is also specified.

Hypothesis (H_n)	Role	Estimate (Independent Variable)	Coping Response (Dependent Variable)	Predicted Sign of Coefficient for the Estimate
1	Marriage	Control	Active/Passive	Positive
2	Parenting	Control	Passive	Positive
3	Parenting	Control	Active (Discipline)	Negative
4	Occupation	Control	Passive	Positive
5	Occupation	Control	Active	Negative
6	Economic Management	Control	Passive	Positive

Hypothesis (H_n)	Role	Estimate (Independent Variable)	Coping Response (Dependent Variable)	Predicted Sign of Coefficient for the Estimate
7	Marriage	Efficacy	Active/Passive	Positive
8	Parenting	Efficacy	Passive	Positive
9	Parenting	Efficacy	Active (Discipline)	Negative
10	Occupation	Efficacy	Passive	Positive
11	Occupation	Efficacy	Active	Negative
12	Economic Management	Efficacy	Passive	Positive

Hypotheses About Subjective Stress

Efficacy Estimates

The general hypothesis regarding efficacy estimates and subjective stress (from page 15) is that (high) efficacy estimates will be related to (low) levels of subjective stress in each of the four roles. Specifically, it is predicted that the net contribution of the role-specific efficacy estimate to prediction of subjective stress will be significant in each of the four roles. "Net contribution" refers to the contribution of the estimate to the total variance over and above (a) exogenous variables, (b) socially desirable response set, (c) the role-specific control estimate, (d) the role-specific strain estimate, and (e) the role-specific passive coping score. The elements of the four specific hypotheses are given below.

Hypothesis (H_n)	Role	Estimate (Independent Variable)	Predicted Score (Dependent Variable)	Predicted Sign of the Coefficient for the Estimate
13	Marriage	Efficacy	Subjective Stress	Positive
14	Parenting	Efficacy	Subjective Stress	Positive
15	Occupation	Efficacy	Subjective Stress	Positive
16	Economic Management	Efficacy	Subjective Stress	Positive

Control Estimates

In the intensely personal roles of marriage and parenting, it is predicted that (high) control estimates will be related to (low) levels of subjective stress (page 16). Specifically, it is posited that the net contribution of the control estimate to prediction of subjective stress will be significant. "Net contribution" refers to the contribution of the control estimate to the total variance over and above (a) exogenous variables, (b) response set, (c) the role-specific efficacy estimate, and (d) role-specific strain. It is also expected that the net contribution of the control estimate will be significant over and above an additional variable--role-specific passive coping. The two specific hypotheses are given below.

Hypotheses (H_n)	Role	Estimate (Independent Variable)	Score (Dependent Variable)	Predicted Sign of the Coefficient for the Estimate
17	Marriage	Control	Subjective Stress	Positive
18	Parenting	Control	Subjective Stress	Positive

In the two impersonal roles of occupation and economic management, frequency of passive coping is expected to specify the relationship between the control estimate and subjective stress. In these roles, (high) control estimates are expected to be related to low subjective stress levels only when passive coping is taken into account. That is, the net contribution of the control estimate to the prediction of subjective stress is expected to be significant only after passive coping is taken into account. Elements of these hypotheses are stated below.

Hypothesis (H_n)	Role	Estimate (Independent Variable)	Score (Dependent Variable)	Predicted Sign of the Coefficient for the Estimate After Passive Coping Has Entered the Equation
19	Occupation	Control	Subjective Stress	Positive
20	Economic Management	Control	Subjective Stress	Positive

Passive Coping

The general hypothesis (from page 16) is that (high) reported frequency of use of passive coping responses will be related to (high) levels of subjective stress in the intensely personal roles of marriage and parenting, and to (low) levels of subjective stress in the impersonal roles of occupation and economic management. The net contribution of the passive coping score to the prediction of subjective stress in each role should be significant. "Net contribution" refers to the contribution of the passive coping score to the total variance

over and above (a) exogenous variables, (b) response set, (c) role-specific control and efficacy estimates, and (d) role-specific strain scores. The four specific hypotheses are listed below.

Hypothesis (H_n)	Role	Coping Response (Independent Variable)	Score (Dependent Variable)	Predicted Sign of the Coefficient for the Coping Response Variable
21	Marriage	Active/Passive	Subjective Stress	Positive
22	Parenting	Passive	Subjective Stress	Positive
23	Occupation	Passive	Subjective Stress	Negative
24	Economic Management	Passive	Subjective Stress	Negative

Hypothesis About Self-Esteem

The general hypothesis (from page 16) is that (high) efficacy estimates should be related to (low) levels of subjective stress in each role. Hypothesis 25 (H_{25}) states that the contribution of a composite efficacy estimate to prediction of self-esteem will be significant over and above exogenous variables, SDS, and the composite estimate of control. The sign of the coefficient for the composite efficacy estimate will be negative.

Statistical Analysis

For each criterion variable (coping response or subjective stress) in each role, a regression model was used to test the specific hypotheses. A regression model was also used to test the hypothesis about self-esteem.

The Regression Model for Testing Hypotheses About Coping Response Modes (H_1-H_{12})

I defined six coping responses (three passive, two active, and one active/passive) within the four role areas. Therefore, a regression analysis was conducted for each coping response yielding a total of six regression analyses in which a coping response was the criterion variable. For each of the six analyses a standard regression model was used to test the specific hypotheses.[18] Predictor variables in each analysis included: (1) the role specific control estimate, (2) exogenous variables of age, income, education, and (in occupation only) occupational status, (3) SDS, (4) the role specific efficacy estimate, and (5) role specific strain.

The Regression Model for Testing Hypotheses About Subjective Stress (H_{13} - H_{24})

Each of the four role specific subjective stress variables was used as a criterion in a regression analysis, yielding four regression analyses. A hierarchical model was used because entry of passive coping into the equation for each impersonal role was expected to alter the magnitude of the coefficient for the control estimate (H_{23}, H_{24}). Predictor variables initially entered were the role specific control estimate, exogenous variables, SDS, the role specific efficacy estimate, and role specific strain. The role specific passive coping

---

[18] All conclusions are based on the total equation. However, to address secondary issues involving variance shared among the two estimates, strain and the criterion variable; efficacy and strain were entered on subsequent steps after control, exogenous variables, and SDS for all role specific regression analyses. Additional details are given in Appendix 4.

variable entered on the final step.

The Regression Model for Testing The Hypothesis About Self-Esteem

A standard regression model was used to test the hypothesis about self-esteem (H_{25}). The criterion variable was the self-esteem score, and predictor variables in the equation were the composite control estimate, income, education, age, SDS, and the composite efficacy estimate.

Evaluation of Hypotheses

I used a one-tailed test of significance for each hypothesis[19] because the sign of the coefficient was predicted by each hypothesis. An alpha level of .01 was adopted for testing each hypothesis for the total sample. Of course, the experimentwise alpha was not as stringent as the stated level of .01 because of the numerous hypotheses tested.[20]

In order to provide replication of results, to suggest the stability of results reported for the total sample, and to reduce capitalization on chance, a hold-out sample was used. On pre-coded tabulation sheets, a series of numbers in five randomly ordered blocks (each block containing a random ordering of the numbers 1 and 2 with the restriction that each number appear twice in the block) was placed

---

[19] In order to make a one-tailed test, the square root of the tabled F value (for each coefficient about which a specific prediction was made) was calculated, yielding the absolute value of t--a statistic appropriate for a one-tailed test (Nie et al., 1970).

[20] It should be noted that criterion variables are not orthogonal. For instance, role specific subjective stress variables are correlated. However, multivariate techniques permitting simultaneous tests of hypotheses across roles were not viable options because of the large amount of missing data--the result of most subjects not being engaged in at least one of the roles.

beside each case number prior to receipt of completed questionnaires. Questionnaires were assigned a case number prior to coding and in the order in which they were returned. All cases designated with a _1_ belonged to the first sample, and cases numbered _2_ belonged to the second hold-out sample. Results of the regression analyses for all three samples are given for all criterion variables. An exception was made regarding active coping in parenting because use of a hold-out sample would have resulted in unacceptably small sample sizes. (The active response was appropriate only for women with children younger than 21, and many women did not have children under 21.) Generally sizes of _N_s for the hold out sample were not large (ranging between 40 and 90). The table of results for each regression analysis contains the unstandardized (_b_) regression coefficient, the standardized (beta) coefficient, and the associated _F_ for each variable in the equation.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Correlations Between Exogenous Variables and Key Variables

Resources

The exogenous variables of income, education, and occupational status can be viewed as indices of resources upon which an individual draws when confronted with strains and problems in everyday life roles. Low personal resources may exacerbate role strain and also be associated with low control or low efficacy estimates as well as the type of coping response employed and the magnitude of subjective stress associated with the role. Zero-order correlations between efficacy, control, coping response, and stress scores in each role and each resource variable are shown in Table 27.

In the marital domain, estimates of control and efficacy tend to be independent of resources although modest correlations are found between both efficacy and control estimates and income, with low income being associated with lower estimates of control and efficacy. Similarly, scores on coping response scales and stress scales in marriage tend to be independent of resources. In the parenting area (Table 27), control and stress tend to be associated with low resources. Also, coping responses are associated with educational level. The higher the educational attainment, the more likely that employment of passive coping will be reported, and the less likely that employment of active

TABLE 27

ZERO ORDER CORRELATIONS (PEARSON'S r) OF ROLE SCALES WITH ROLE STRAIN AND OTHER VARIABLES

	Resources											
	Income		Education		Occupational Status		Crowne-Marlowe SDS		Age		Role Strain	
	r	N	r	N	r	N	r	N	r	N	r	N
Marriage												
Control	-.115	187	.015	193	.053	143	-.092	197	.070	187	.438**	159
Efficacy	-.096	149	-.015	153	-.018	114	-.181*	115	-.067	149	.408**	158
Passive Coping	-.063	150	.053	153	-.084	114	-.212**	155	.066	148	.533**	157
Stress	-.112	148	.025	152	.005	113	-.222**	154	-.113	148	.712**	157
Parenting												
Control	.042	184	.045	184	.060	142	-.230**	193	.067	183	.078	128
Efficacy	-.210*	116	-.185*	120	-.234*	88	-.132	123	-.003	114	.093	126
Passive Coping	-.114	118	-.225**	122	.167	88	-.175*	125	.183*	115	.146	128
Active Coping	-.059	118	-.324**	122	-.059	88	.052	125	-.353**	116	.469**	128
Stress	-.104	116	-.002	120	-.049	86	-.259**	123	-.111	114	.374**	126
Occupation												
Control	-.046	188	-.080	194	-.258**	145	-.174*	198	.051	188	.168*	185
Efficacy	-.243**	169	-.039	175	-.100	143	-.132	178	-.129	17	.225**	182
Passive Coping	-.164	171	-.125	176	-.286**	145	-.131	178	-.132	171	.004	181
Active Coping	.023	169	.004	174	.025	143	-.036	178	-.109	169	.276**	145
Stress	-.128	169	.150*	174	.008	142	-.277**	177	-.172*	169	.538**	181
Economics												
Control	-.311**	188	-.189**	194	-.208**	145	-.058	198	-.130	188	.502**	198
Efficacy	-.171*	184	-.105	188	-.137	144	-.254**	198	-.036	184	.391**	195
Passive Coping	-.072	182	-.097	187	-.147	143	-.055	191	-.018	182	.129	194
Stress	-.201*	182	.076	185	-.039	142	-.264**	189	-.313**	181	.689**	192

*p < .05 (two-tailed)

**p < .01

coping (i.e., "discipline") will be reported in the parental role. It is interesting to note that higher educational attainment is associated with higher passive coping scores but is associated with lower efficacy scores. It will be shown in later analyses that lower efficacy scores are associated with higher passive coping scores. Thus, in parenting, educational attainment could act as a suppressor variable regarding the relation between efficacy and passive coping.

In contrast to the intensely personal roles of marriage and parenting, control estimates are related to occupational status in economic and occupational roles, and to income in economics (Table 27). Efficacy and income are correlated in both impersonal roles. Subjective stress in economics is correlated with income, and subjective stress in occupational role is correlated with educational attainment. In occupation the tendency to employ passive coping is associated with lower occupational status. Therefore, in the impersonal roles, it is possible that any association between estimates of either control or efficacy and the variables of subjective stress and passive coping may be related to the variance these variables share with resource variables.

Socially Desirable Response Set

There is a tendency for both theoretically interesting variables of control and efficacy estimates, and the passive coping and stress variables to be associated with Crown-Marlowe scores (a measure of socially desirable response set), and this association is seen in most roles (Table 27). Therefore, utilization of the Crowne-Marlowe scale as a covariate is appropriate.

Age

Younger women are more likely to report the employment of discipline in parenting. This may be partially explained by the fact that younger women are more likely to have young children and discipline would be more appropriate for younger children. Also, younger age of the mother is associated with higher passive coping scores in parenting but lower passive coping scores in occupation. Increasing age is associated with higher efficacy estimates in occupation and higher control estimates in economics.

Role Strain

With the exception of parenting, lower efficacy and control estimates are associated with higher levels of role strain (Table 27). Particularly in marriage, employment of passive coping responses is more likely to be reported at higher levels of role strain. In parenting, the employment of discipline is reported more frequently as reported intensity of strain increases. Also, perceived stress and perceived strain are highly correlated in all roles.

Zero-Order Correlations Between Control Estimates, Efficacy Estimates, and Dependent Variables

Table 42 of Appendix 3 contains zero-order correlations between each type of estimate and each dependent variable in each role. Coefficients for each hold-out sample and the total sample are given. Exactly 56 coefficients are listed, and 37 of the 56 coefficients are significant ($p < .01$). The coefficient between control estimates and active coping ("discipline") in the parental domain is not statistically significant, and the sign of the coefficient is counter to the

prediction. The signs for all other coefficients correspond to predictions.

Regression Analyses of Coping Responses

Marriage: the Active/Passive Coping Response Mode (H_1 and H_7)

The regression equations for both samples and for the total sample are given in Table 28. The same pattern of results are shown in both samples and in the total sample with respect to control estimates and efficacy estimates. This pattern is reflected in the final column of the table that shows coefficients for the final regression equation from the total sample. Hypothesis 7 is supported in that the efficacy estimate significantly contributes to the prediction of the active/passive coping score over and above exogenous variables, and the control estimate ($p < .01$).[20] Results fail to support Hypothesis 1 (that the net contribution of the control estimate to the prediction of active/passive coping scores would be significant). Entry of the efficacy estimate into the equation significantly reduces the magnitude of the regression coefficient for the control estimate so that the control estimate accounts for less than 1% of the variance after the efficacy estimate is taken into account (Table 47; Appendix 4), and the coefficient for the control estimate is not significant ($p > .01$).

The coefficients for role strain and age are also significant (Table 28). In the marital domain, reported frequency of use of passive responses (as opposed to active responses) is directly related predictors. The [illegible]

---

[20] The magnitude of the coefficient for efficacy is attenuated when role strain enters the equation although the coefficient remains statistically significant (Table 47; Appendix 4).

terms.

[illegible]

[illegible]

The regression [illegible]

results are given in [illegible]

In [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

active [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The [illegible]

(Table [illegible]). [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

TABLE 28

ACTIVE/PASSIVE COPING IN MARRIAGE: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS

		Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Variable				
Control (H_1)	*b*	-.056	-.058	-.068
	beta	-.072	-.052	-.073
	F	.347	.226	.851
SDS	*b*	-.009	-.041	-.023
	beta	-.060	-.246	-.143
	F	1.336	5.062*	3.802
Education	*b*	.115	.034	.021
	beta	.038	.010	.054
	F	.136	.785	.000
Income	*b*	.039	-.039	.017
	beta	.070	-.052	.001
	F	.383	.223	.535
Age	*b*	.012	.021	.016
	beta	.159	.238	.187
	F	2.348	4.896*	6.691**
Efficacy (H_7)	*b*	.259	.282	.290
	beta	.280	.289	.304
	F	6.205**	6.141**	15.171**
Strain	*b*	.289	.329	.290
	beta	.478	.461	.432
	F	13.879**	19.138**	30.729**
Constant		1.481	7.723	1.731
N		74	65	139
R		.401*	.698**	.502**
DF				
for *R*		67	58	132
for each coefficient		1,67	1,58	1,132

NOTE: For all regression analyses, unstandardized coefficients (*b*), standardized coefficients (beta), and *F* values ($F = t^2$) are given (consecutively) for each variable. One-tailed significance levels are used for scale coefficients because direction is predicted for theoretically interesting scales.

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

to the intensity of role strain and age. As expected, high efficacy estimates are associated with reports of more frequent attempts to seek compromise, and to initiate communication directed toward solving marital problems, whereas responses that involve avoidance of communication (i.e., keeping hurt feelings to oneself and avoiding contact with one's spouse) and ignoring marital problems are more frequently employed when estimates of efficacy are low.[21]

Parenting: the Passive Coping Response Mode (H_2 and H_8)

As in the marital domain, the unstandardized partial regression coefficient for the efficacy estimate is significant ($p < .01$) in the equation for the total sample (Table 29). While the coefficients for the efficacy estimate in the relatively small hold-out samples do not reach statistical significance ($p > .01$; Table 29), they are similar in magnitude to the coefficient for the efficacy estimate in the total sample. Results tend to support the hypothesis that the efficacy estimate significantly contributes to prediction of the reported frequency of passive coping in parenting (H_8). Apparently, attempts to deal with problems in parenting by ignoring the problem and minimizing the severity or duration of the problem are more frequent when efficacy estimates are low.

Although age and education tend to be related to frequency of

---

[21] In marriage, active response items were inverted to form a single active/passive coping dimension. The pattern of results reported above were also found when active items alone and when passive items alone were regressed on the set of dependent variables. As expected, the coefficient for the efficacy estimate was significant for active items scored alone and for passive items scored alone (Table 45; Appendix 3). As would be expected, the sign of the coefficient was negative in the analysis of active scores.

TABLE 29

PASSIVE COPING IN PARENTING: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Variable		Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Control (H_2)	*b*	.120	.084	.115
	beta	.118	.110	.128
	F	.666	.654	1.902
SDS	*b*	-.001	-.024	-.012
	beta	-.004	-.199	-.079
	F	.001	1.991	.690
Education	*b*	.123	.051	.090
	beta	.351	.197	.295
	F	6.073**	1.174	8.742**
Income	*b*	-.096	-.075	-.097
	beta	-.141	-.137	-.157
	F	1.062	.893	2.750
Age	*b*	.020	.030	.024
	beta	.207	.388	.275
	F	2.051	8.215**	8.439**
Efficacy (H_8)	*b*	.250	.268	.206
	beta	.252	.242	.238
	F	3.564	3.371	7.007**
Strain	*b*	.129	.387	.181
	beta	.152	.366	.225
	F	1.344	7.612**	6.330**
Constant		-.162	3.871	1.981
N		55	52	107
R		.552**	.613**	.584**
DF				
for *R*		48	45	100
for each coefficient		1,48	1,45	1,100

NOTE: Entry of age of youngest child into regressions did not alter results in any parenting analysis.

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

passive coping efforts in parenting, the relationships are inconsistent across hold-out samples (Table 29). The direction of the tendency is for higher educational attainment and older age of the mother to be related to more frequent passive coping attempts. As in the marital role, the hypothesis that estimated control would contribute to the prediction of reported frequency of passive coping efforts (H_2) is not supported. Although the control estimate is correlated with passive coping scores (Table 42; Appendix 3), the association between control estimates and passive coping is due, in large part, to variance shared with other dependent variables--particularly perceived strain (Table 48; Appendix 4). However, failure to find net association between control estimates and passive coping scores in the parental role could be related to the relatively low internal consistency (alpha = .62) of the parental control scale. Indeed, an underestimate of the coefficient for control could lead to an overestimate of the coefficient for the efficacy estimate because the two estimates are correlated (Darlington, 1968; Nie et al., 1970). The internal consistency estimate for a control scale including items from both parental and marital domains is higher (alpha = .75) than the internal consistency estimate for the parental control scale alone. However, substitution of the combined scale for the parental control scale does not alter the pattern of results for efficacy estimates or for control estimates (Table 30). Although coefficients for the control estimate are marginally higher when the combined scale is used, the unstandardized partial regression coefficient for the combined control estimate is not statistically significant ($\underline{p} > .01$) in any of the samples (Table 30).

TABLE 30

PASSIVE COPING IN PARENTING: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS IN WHICH A COMPOSITE PERSONAL CONTROL SCALE IS SUBSTITUTED FOR THE ROLE-SPECIFIC CONTROL SCALE

		Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Variable				
Control (H_2)	*b*	.248	.045	.157
	beta	.234	.049	.159
	F	2.792	.149	3.122
SDS	*b*	.008	-.027	-.010
	beta	.047	-.022	-.072
	F	.114	2.635	.581
Education	*b*	.122	.045	.088
	beta	.348	.173	.288
	F	6.245**	1.395	8.526**
Income	*b*	-.079	-.056	-.082
	beta	-.115	-.103	-.134
	F	.730	.558	2.057
Age	*b*	.185	.307	.024
	beta	.193	.393	.271
	F	1.989	8.106**	8.372**
Efficacy (H_8)	*b*	.216	.196	.204
	beta	.218	.258	.237
	F	2.813	7.618**	7.198**
Strain	*b*	.132	.269	.184
	beta	.155	.369	.231
	F	1.517	7.618**	6.747**
N		56	54	110
DF for each coefficient		1,49	1,47	1,103

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Parenting: the Active Response Mode (Discipline) H_3 and H_9

A single regression analysis limited to mothers with children under the age of 21 is reported in Table 31. Neither the coefficient for the control estimate nor the coefficient for the efficacy estimate is statistically significant ($p < .01$); therefore neither hypothesis 3 nor hypothesis 9 (which predict significant contributions of the efficacy estimate and the control estimate to prediction of the discipline score) are supported. Furthermore, the sign of the coefficient for the control estimate is opposite to that predicted by hypothesis 3. Although not statistically significant, there is an unexpected tendency for reported use of discipline to be more frequent when control estimates are low. Examination of the discipline items, however, suggests that the discipline scale may represent threats, and scolding rather than the actual exercise of discipline. Possibly, threatening punishment and scolding may be acts of desperation rather than an exercise of control. Also, younger age of the mother and more intense role strain are associated with a higher reported frequency of use of discipline. (Table 49 in Appendix 4 gives additional details regarding the regression analysis.)

Occupation: the Passive Coping Response Mode (H_4 and H_{10})

In the occupational role, neither the efficacy estimate nor the control estimate contributes significantly to the prediction of the passive coping score (Table 32); therefore, neither hypothesis 4 nor hypothesis 10 is supported by results of the analyses. Coefficients for a single variable, occupational status, are significant in the

TABLE 31

ACTIVE COPING IN PARENTING: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Variable		Total Sample
Control	*b*	.258
(H_3)	beta	.197
	F	2.462
SDS	*b*	.044
	beta	.182
	F	2.022
Education	*b*	-.157
	beta	-.324
	F	5.450*
Income	*b*	.260
	beta	.280
	F	5.527*
Age	*b*	-.068
	beta	-.350
	F	9.022**
Efficacy	*b*	-.222
(H_9)	beta	-.166
	F	1.715
Strain	*b*	.442
	beta	.335
	F	7.075**
Constant		5.681
N		57
R		.681**
DF		
for *R*		50
for each coefficient		1,50

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 32

PASSIVE COPING IN OCCUPATION: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS

		Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Variable				
Control (H_4)	*b*	-.078	.156	.048
	beta	-.091	.193	.058
	F	.613	1.851	.430
SDS	*b*	-.012	-.031	-.019
	beta	-.080	-.197	-.125
	F	.464	2.377	2.005
Education	*b*	.032	.106	.056
	beta	.104	.359	.186
	F	.387	4.447*	2.450
Income	*b*	-.113	.062	-.026
	beta	-.201	.104	-.044
	F	2.884	.572	.247
Age	*b*	.002	-.016	-.004
	beta	.023	-.194	-.047
	F	.040	2.078	.278
Occupational Status	*b*	-.010	-.023	-.014
	beta	-.215	-.536	-.318
	F	1.708	8.159**	6.768**
Efficacy (H_{10})	*b*	.186	.019	.117
	beta	.220	.018	.132
	F	3.859	.023	2.389
Strain	*b*	.290	-.185	.133
	beta	.337	-.163	.138
	F	9.320**	1.458	2.553
Constant		3.301	4.041	3.270
N		72	60	132
R		.537**	.527**	.523**
DF				
for *R*		64	53	129
for each coefficient		1.64	1.53	1.129

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

second sample and in the total sample. Apparently, women in lower status jobs are more likely to wait for job difficulties to work out, denigrate the importance of job difficulties, focus only on job duties, accept the job situation, and simply endure job strains than are women in higher status jobs. As noted in an earlier discussion control estimates, efficacy estimates, and coping mode in the occupational domain tend to be correlated with objective indices of status and resources. (Table 50 of Appendix 4 gives additional details about these analyses.)

Occupation: the Active Coping Response Mode (H_5 and H_{11})

Coefficients from the regression analysis of the active coping mode in occupation are shown in Table 33. The coefficient for the control estimate is significant for the total sample ($p < .01$). However, the coefficient for the control estimate is not significant in either of the hold-out samples. In the first sample, the net association between the control estimate and the active coping score represents less than 0.8% of the variance. Results for the total sample suggest that there is a tendency for high control estimates to be associated with more frequent active coping efforts as predicted by hypothesis 5. However, failure to find consistently strong associations between estimations of control and frequency of active coping across the hold-out samples suggests that the finding is tenuous and needs to be replicated. The coefficient for the efficacy estimate is not significant in any of the samples; therefore, hypothesis 11 (suggesting a significant net association between the efficacy estimate and the active coping score) is not supported by the results. (See

TABLE 33

ACTIVE COPING IN OCCUPATION: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS

		Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Variable				
Control	b	-.118	-.310	-.258
(H_5)	beta	-.089	-.279	-.211
	F	.501	3.875	5.367**
SDS	b	-.027	-.030	-.031
	beta	-.120	-.134	-.136
	F	.872	1.115	2.231
Education	b	.102	-.101	-.003
	beta	.237	-.246	-.006
	F	1.644	2.119	.002
Income	b	.209	-.017	.111
	beta	.240	-.021	.131
	F	3.428	.024	2.005
Age	b	-.008	-.008	-.014
	beta	-.072	-.072	-.115
	F	.349	.283	1.600
Occupational Status	b	-.020	.024	.004
	beta	-.280	.395	.062
	F	2.391	4.455*	.245
Efficacy	b	-.095	-.181	-.116
(H_{11})	beta	-.072	-.139	-.089
	F	.349	1.196	1.025
Strain	b	.125	.450	.213
	beta	.094	.285	.151
	F	1.604	4.530*	2.845
Constant		4.822	6.351	6.362
N		72	60	132
R		.342	.530*	.314*
DF				
for R		64	52	124
for each coefficient		1,64	1,52	1,124

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Table 51 in Appendix 4 for additional details.)

Economic Management: the Passive Coping Response Mode (H_6 and H_{12})

As can be seen from Table 34, the multivariate regression equation accounts for only a small percentage of the variance (12.2% in the total sample) in scores on the passive coping response scale. The coefficient for the control estimate is statistically significant in the total sample and in the second hold-out sample ($p < .01$; Table 34). The coefficient for the control estimate is not statistically significant in the first hold-out sample; however, the sign of the coefficient is as predicted. Apparently, there is a tendency for low estimates of control to be associated with more frequent passive coping attempts that involve acceptance of economic strains and minimization of the importance of money problems; however, the finding is not strongly replicated by use of the hold-out sample. Results, therefore, tend to support hypothesis 6 that posits a relationship between control estimates and reported frequency of passive coping efforts. Hypothesis 12, suggesting a net association between efficacy estimates and reported frequency of passive coping, is not supported by results of the analysis. (Table 52 in Appendix 4 gives supplementary information about these analyses.)

Regression Analyses of Subjective Stress

Marriage (H_{13}, H_{17}, H_{21})

Coefficients for the final equations of the regressions of subjective stress on the dependent variables are given in Table 35. The coefficients for the passive coping term are significant ($p < .01$)

TABLE 34

PASSIVE COPING IN ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS

		Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Variable				
Control (H_6)	*b*	.081	.273	.176
	beta	.107	.313	.214
	F	.633	5.882**	5.843**
SDS	*b*	-.026	-.050	-.037
	beta	-.175	-.287	-.228
	F	2.332	5.402**	7.865**
Education	*b*	-.021	-.026	-.024
	beta	-.065	-.080	-.074
	F	.302	.472	.838
Income	*b*	-.021	-.033	-.018
	beta	-.037	-.050	-.029
	F	.083	.190	.119
Age	*b*	.017	.018	.016
	beta	.219	.195	.189
	F	3.353	2.486	5.272**
Efficacy (H_{12})	*b*	.045	-.093	-.020
	beta	.061	-.125	-.027
	F	.224	.913	.100
Strain	*b*	.081	-.007	.043
	beta	.116	-.009	.060
	F	.625	.005	.398
Constant		-.565	4.321	4.083
N		86	88	173
R		.228	.371	.350**
DF				
for *R*		79	81	167
for each coefficient		1,79	1,81	1,167

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 35

SUBJECTIVE STRESS IN MARRIAGE: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS

		Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Variable				
Control	*b*	.470	-.024	.237
(H_{17})	beta	.369	-.016	.175
	F	15.100**	.027	6.811**
SDS	*b*	-.007	-.006	-.007
	beta	-.032	-.028	-.031
	F	.163	.075	.255
Education	*b*	.048	.008	.019
	beta	.098	.017	.040
	F	1.535	.031	.408
Income	*b*	.118	-.076	.029
	beta	.129	-.077	.032
	F	2.282	.615	.234
Age	*b*	-.018	-.009	-.012
	beta	-.141	-.076	-.100
	F	2.216	.583	2.529
Efficacy	*b*	.098	.153	.099
(H_{13})	beta	.065	.119	.070
	F	.357	1.178	1.027
Strain	*b*	.351	.540	.472
	beta	.357	.575	.489
	F	11.513**	27.913**	45.141**
Passive	*b*	.365	.229	.290
Coping	beta	.224	.173	.220
(H_{21})	*F*	6.043**	2.185	7.589**
Constant		-1.712	-4.170	-6.160
N		74	65	139
R		.810**	.759**	.761**
DF				
for *R*		66	57	131
for each coefficient		1,66	1,57	1,131

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

in the first hold-out sample and in the total sample. The sign of the coefficient for the passive coping term in the second sample is as predicted, and the unstandardized coefficient is within one standard error of the unstandardized coefficient for the passive coping term in the total sample although the coefficient for the passive coping term fails to be statistically significant within the second sample (Table 35). Results generally support the findings of Pearlin and Schooler (1978) regarding the association between passive coping and subjective stress in marriage and tend to support hypothesis 21 in which a significant net association between passive coping and subjective stress in marriage is predicted. As expected, frequent (reported) efforts to ignore marital problems and avoid interaction with one's spouse when problems occur (as opposed to efforts to seek compromise, and communication in the face of problems) are associated with higher levels of subjective stress in marriage.

The coefficients for the control estimate are significant in the first hold-out sample and in the total sample ($p < .01$); however, the coefficient for the control estimate in the second sample is not statistically significant ($p > .01$). In fact the coefficient for the control term in the second sample is close to zero (beta = -.016), and the sign of the coefficient is counter to predictions. Although results from the total sample tend to support the hypothesis that estimates of control significantly contribute to prediction of subjective stress in marriage (H_{17}) results regarding control estimates are inconsistent across hold-out samples. As expected, entry of passive coping into the regression equation (Table 53; Appendix 4) does not materially alter the magnitude or the sign of the coefficient for the

control term in any sample.

The coefficients for the efficacy estimate are not significant ($p > .01$); therefore H_{13} is not supported by the results. In all samples, the coefficients for the efficacy estimate are significant when the strain term and the passive coping term are not in the equation (Table 53; Appendix 4). Apparently, the association between the efficacy estimate and subjective stress is due, in large part, to variance shared by the efficacy estimate, perceived strain, and the passive coping term.

Parenting (H_{14}, H_{18}, H_{22})

Regression analyses for subjective stress in parenting are presented in Table 36. As in marriage, the passive coping term tends to be a significant predictor of subjective stress. The coefficients for the passive coping term are significant in all three samples ($p < .01$), and the hypothesized relationship between the passive coping mode and subjective stress (H_{22}) is supported. As in marriage, frequent use of the passive coping mode involving ignoring of the problem and attempting to minimize the importance of the problem is associated with higher levels of subjective stress in parenting. Pearlin and Schooler (1978) also found that higher passive coping scores were associated with higher levels of subjective stress in parenting.

The coefficient for the efficacy estimate is significant in the first sample and in the total sample ($p < .01$). The coefficient for the efficacy estimate is not significant in the second sample ($p > .01$), although the sign of the coefficient is as predicted (Table 36). Although not strongly confirmed by use of a hold-out sample, results generally support hypothesis 14 that posits an association between the

TABLE 36

SUBJECTIVE STRESS IN PARENTING: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Variable		Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Control H_{18}	*b*	-.008	.172	.063
	beta	-.073	.140	.051
	F	.380	1.233	.368
SDS	*b*	-.028	-.027	-.023
	beta	-.141	-.139	-.112
	F	1.535	1.107	1.708
Education	*b*	-.002	-.019	-.023
	beta	-.005	-.048	-.054
	F	.002	.116	.340
Income	*b*	.162	-.025	.058
	beta	.208	-.028	.068
	F	3.407	.044	.635
Age	*b*	-.005	-.008	-.006
	beta	-.046	-.063	-.053
	F	.145	.218	.339
Efficacy H_{14}	*b*	.395	.182	.343
	beta	.347	.150	.265
	F	9.471**	1.432	10.132**
Stress	*b*	.393	.340	.341
	beta	.402	.291	.308
	F	13.887**	4.876**	13.835**
Passive Coping H_{22}	*b*	.425	.543	.451
	beta	.370	.341	.327
	F	9.939**	6.197**	13.546**
Constant		-.598	3.919	1.027
N		55	52	107
R		.741**	.679**	.670**
DF				
for *R*		47	44	99
for each coefficient		1,47	1,44	1,99

NOTE: "Discipline" in parenting was not significantly correlated with stress (r (102) = .13, $p > .05$), and entry of "discipline" into the regression did not alter the pattern of results.

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

efficacy estimate and subjective stress in parenting. Specifically, a lack of confidence in one's own relative ability to handle problems in parenting tends to be associated with higher levels of subjective stress. The coefficients for the control estimate are not significant ($p > .01$), and no support for hypothesis 18 is found in the results. An association observed between the control estimate and subjective stress on earlier steps of the regression analysis (Table 54; Appendix 4) is due, in large part, to variance shared by the control estimate, the efficacy estimate, and the role strain term (Table 54).[22]

Occupation (H_{15}, H_{19}, and H_{23})

Regression analyses of subjective stress in occupation support none of the relevant hypotheses (Table 37). Neither the passive coping term, nor the control estimate, nor the efficacy estimate significantly contributes to prediction of subjective stress in occupation. In occupation, the only statistically significant partial coefficients are those for the strain term. (The coefficients for the strain terms are significant in all regression analyses of subjective stress in all roles.) Pearlin and Schooler (1978) found that the net contribution of coping response terms to prediction of subjective stress was smallest in occupational role as compared to the three other roles. Similarly, the net contribution of the passive term, in current analyses, is smallest in the occupational role.[23] In all other roles, the

---

[22] The active coping term in parenting is not significantly correlated with subjective stress ($r = .13$; $p > .05$). Entry of the active term into the regression analysis does not alter the pattern of results reported above.

[23] Additionally, the active coping term in occupation is not correlated with subjective stress ($r = .001$). When the active term is entered into the regression analysis for the total sample in occupation, the coefficient for the term is not significant ($b = .042$, $p > .01$) and does not alter the pattern of results reported above.

TABLE 37

SUBJECTIVE STRESS IN OCCUPATION: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS

		Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Variable				
Control (H_{19})	*b*	.249	-.146	.069
	beta	.172	-.142	.055
	F	2.656	1.248	.511
SDS	*b*	-.003	-.049	-.031
	beta	-.013	-.242	-.136
	F	.016	4.435*	3.091
Education	*b*	.080	.000	.056
	beta	.153	.001	.124
	F	1.000	.000	1.375
Income	*b*	-.041	-.066	-.061
	beta	-.043	-.088	-.007
	F	.155	.509	.792
Age	*b*	-.011	.010	-.003
	beta	-.083	.095	-.024
	F	.632	.618	.287
Occupational Status	*b*	.008	.002	.004
	beta	.107	.029	.058
	F	.493	.028	.287
Efficacy (H_{15})	*b*	-.074	.228	.100
	beta	-.052	.190	.074
	F	.241	2.861	.989
Strain	*b*	.719	.744	.709
	beta	.509	.511	.486
	F	20.910**	18.083**	40.834**
Passive Coping (H_{23})	*b*	.184	.112	.104
	beta	.109	.088	.069
	F	.910	.517	.780
Constant		1.172	1.170	1.579
N		72	60	132
R		.646**	.670**	.629**
DF				
for *R*		63	51	131
for each coefficient		1,63	1,51	1,131

NOTE: Active coping in occupation was not correlated with stress (*r* (135) = .001, *p* > .05), and entry of active coping into the regression did not alter the pattern of results.

$^{*}p < .05$

$^{**}p < .01$

coefficient for the passive coping term is significant in at least one of the reported samples. (Table 55 in Appendix 4 gives further details of these analyses.)

Economic Management (H_{16}, H_{20}, and H_{24})

In the economic management role, the strongest and most consistent relationship between efficacy estimates and subjective role stress is found (Table 38). The coefficients for the efficacy estimate are significant ($p < .01$) in all samples; therefore, hypothesis 16, which posits a net association between efficacy estimates and subjective stress, is consistently supported by the results of all three regression analyses. Specifically, low efficacy estimates are associated with higher levels of subjective stress in economic management.

Pearlin and Schooler (1978) found an inverse relationship between frequency of passive coping and subjective stress in economic management; therefore, an inverse relationship between passive coping frequency and subjective stress was predicted in the economic management role (H_{24}). As expected, the coefficients for the passive coping term are all negative (Table 38); however, the coefficient for the passive term is statistically significant in the second sample only. Thus, hypothesis 24 is not strongly supported by the results of the regression analyses.

It was hypothesized that the control estimate in economic management would be a significant predictor of subjective stress only after passive coping was entered into the equation (H_{20}); however, the coefficients for the control estimate are not statistically significant, and entry of passive coping into the equation does not materially alter the magnitude or the sign of the regression coefficient for the coefficient for the passive mixing term [illegible] of the effective [illegible] (1971, 73 [illegible]) [illegible] of these analyses.)

Economic consequences [illegible]

[illegible] the statistical evidence [illegible] tour vehicle group between efficiency [illegible] is found [illegible] coefficient [illegible] significant [illegible] as are the [illegible] ments [illegible] relation between [illegible] atures, as the significant [illegible] sion analysis [illegible] the effects [illegible] with higher [illegible]

Peoples and Johnson [illegible] between [illegible] manufacturers, [illegible] to dynamic [illegible] ment [illegible] interest [illegible] Peoples [illegible], statistically [illegible] That, however, [illegible]

[illegible]

TABLE 38

SUBJECTIVE STRESS IN ECONOMICS: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS

		Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Variables				
Control (H_{20})	*b*	.002	.066	.037
	beta	.001	.057	.031
	F	.000	.439	.254
SDS	*b*	-.017	-.003	-.014
	beta	-.073	-.013	-.059
	F	.745	.026	1.030
Education	*b*	.103	.042	.073
	beta	.208	.092	.154
	F	5.505*	1.452	7.163**
Income	*b*	.031	.029	.036
	beta	.035	.031	.040
	F	.139	1.452	.465
Age	*b*	.003	-.023	-.008
	beta	.026	-.179	-.063
	F	.087	4.966*	1.169
Efficacy (H_{16})	*b*	.295	.339	.310
	beta	.254	.344	.293
	F	7.764**	15.490**	22.431**
Strain	*b*	.604	.520	.568
	beta	.550	.518	.547
	F	25.381**	34.152**	64.344**
Passive Coping (H_{24})	*b*	-.079	-.232	-.151
	beta	-.047	-.160	-.097
	F	.346	5.059**	3.437
Constant		4.869	1.831	3.089
N		86	83	169
R		.722**	.808**	.755**
DF				
for *R*		78	75	161
for each coefficient		1,78	1,75	1,161

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

control estimate in any of the samples (Table 56; Appendix 4). An association between the control estimate and subjective stress on earlier steps of the regression analysis (Table 56) is due almost entirely to variance shared by the control estimate, the efficacy estimate, and the role strain term (Table 56).

Regression Analysis of Self-Esteem (H_{25})

The hypothesized relationship between estimated efficacy and self-esteem is strongly supported by the regression analyses reported in Table 39. The partial coefficients for the composite efficacy estimate are significant ($p < .01$) in the second and total samples, and the coefficient is marginally significant in the first sample ($p < .05$).[24] The coefficients for the composite control estimate are not significant in any sample (Table 39). The model of Abramson et al., (1978) suggests that "personal helplessness", but not "universal helplessness" should be associated with self-esteem. The definition of efficacy used in the current research corresponds to the "personal helplessness" concept, and the definition given to control parallels the definition of "universal helplessness". Therefore, the finding that efficacy estimates, but not control estimates, are independently related to self-esteem supports the contention regarding self-esteem of that helplessness model (Abramson et al., 1978). Also, it should be noted that the composite efficacy estimate,

---

[24] Reported relationships between efficacy estimates and role specific dependent variables could be due to joint associations with self-esteem. The self-esteem term was entered into all regression analyses for which the efficacy coefficient was statistically significant. Coefficients for the efficacy estimates after entry of self-esteem into the analyses are reported in Table 46 (Appendix 4). Inclusion of self-esteem does not alter the results for the efficacy estimate in any of the analyses.

TABLE 39

SELF-ESTEEM: A REGRESSION ANALYSIS

		Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Variable				
Control (Composite)	*b*	-.076	-.033	-.150
	beta	-.134	-.049	-.084
	F	1.341	.218	1.203
SDS	*b*	.007	.026	.149
	beta	.094	.238	.190
	F	.753	4.911**	6.253**
Education	*b*	.008	.021	.013
	beta	.056	.129	.081
	F	.258	1.587	1.175
Income	*b*	.002	.470	.026
	beta	.006	.144	.088
	F	.003	2.073	1.360
Age	*b*	.001	.000	.002
	beta	.039	.006	.005
	F	.129	.004	.005
Efficacy (Composite)	*b*	-.127	-.187	-.150
	beta	-.231	-.320	-.271
	F	4.229*	7.980**	11.909**
Constant		3.484	2.901	3.202
N		88	84	172
R		.352	.557**	.448**
DF				
for *R*		86	82	166
for each coefficient		1,86	1,82	1,166

*p < .05

**p < .01

but not the composite control estimate, was found to be independently related to depression scores in the pilot study (Table 12). (Additional details of these analyses are given in Table 54 of Appendix 4.)

Are Role Specific Control and Efficacy Estimates Superior to Generalized Estimates Regarding Prediction of Coping Responses?

An important rationale for the development of role specific efficacy and control scales was that role-specific estimates of control or efficacy should show stronger and more consistent relationships to role-specific coping responses and subjective stress scores than a generalized measure of control or efficacy estimates. In order to address the question of whether specific scores show stronger relationships to the role-specific coping and stress variables than generalized scores, each role-specific stress and coping variable was regressed on the composite efficacy and composite control variables (Table 40).[25] The standardized coefficient for each composite scale was compared to that for the corresponding role-specific efficacy or control term taken from the appropriate regression analysis. The standardized partial coefficients for the composite term and role-specific term for efficacy and for control are shown in Table 40 for all regression analyses.

Regarding efficacy, the method of calculation does not materially alter results in marriage. In parenting, the beta coefficients for the role specific efficacy scales are consistently higher than those for the composite across samples for both passive coping and subjective stress. However, the composite score is superior to the

---

[25] Other variables in the equation were age, education, income, SDS, the role strain term and the other estimate (control and efficacy).

TABLE 40

BETAS FOR COMPOSITE EFFICACY AND CONTROL ESTIMATES COMPARED TO BETAS FOR ROLE-SPECIFIC EFFICACY AND CONTROL ESTIMATES FROM REGRESSION ANALYSES OF COPING AND STRESS IN EACH ROLE

	Betas for Efficacy					
	Sample 1		Sample 2		Total	
	Composite	Specific	Composite	Specific	Composite	Specific
Marriage						
Active/ Passive Coping	.28	.28	.27	.29	.29	.30
Stress	.16	.12	.08	.17	.12	.13
Parenting						
Passive Coping	.20	.25	.08	.26	.16	.26
Discipline	----	----	----	----	-.28	-.17
Stress	.30	.44	-.08	.23	.18	.34
Occupation						
Passive Coping	.17	.22	.07	.00	.12	.13
Active Coping	.05	-.07	.10	-.13	.08	-.08
Stress	-.08	-.02	.39	.25	.14	.08
Economics						
Passive Coping	.14	.06	-.19	-.15	-.03	-.03
Stress	.16	.25	.29	.36	.22	.30

TABLE 40-Continued

	Betas for Control					
	Sample 1		Sample 2		Total	
	Composite	Specific	Composite	Specific	Composite	Specific
Marriage						
Active/ Passive Coping	-.04	-.07	.03	-.03	-.01	-.07
Stress	.18	.34	-.05	-.02	.04	.17
Parenting						
Passive Coping	.16	.12	-.01	.11	.06	.13
Discipline	----	----	----	----	.19	.20
Stress	.12	-.02	.28	.14	.16	.05
Occupation						
Passive Coping	.06	-.09	.06	.19	.09	.06
Active Coping	-.22	-.08	-.21	-.27	-.25	-.21
Stress	.23	.16	-.19	-.08	.06	.06
Economics						
Passive Coping	-.23	.11	.31	.22	-.08	.21
Stress	.10	-.09	.01	.19	.05	.06

NOTE: For each dependent variable (role specific coping or stress), a regression analysis using composite efficacy and control scores (and parallel to those reported in Tables 28 through 38 and in Appendix 4) was calculated. In each analysis, both composites (efficacy and control), all exogenous variables, SDS, and role specific strain was entered. For each sample composite betas and role specific betas, taken from earlier tables, are reported to permit comparison of net contributions of each method of estimation.

role-specific score with respect to discipline.

In occupation, method of calculation of the efficacy estimate does not alter results. Neither composite efficacy scores nor role-specific scores consistently contribute to the regressions in the occupational area. In economics, the coefficient for the role-specific efficacy estimate is consistently higher than the coefficient for the composite efficacy estimate across samples. Generally, when method of calculation of the efficacy estimate does make a difference, use of the role-specific score is preferable to use of the composite score. The single exception is for discipline in parenting.

Regarding method of calculation of control estimates, role-specific scores tend to be superior to composite scores for prediction of subjective stress in marriage (Table 40). Also, in economic management, the role-specific control estimate tends to be superior to the composite estimate for prediction of the passive coping term. On the other hand, in parenting the standardized coefficients for the composite control estimate are larger than comparable coefficients for the role-specific control estimates, and the magnitudes of the coefficients for the composite control estimates are more consistent across samples. Also, in occupation, the partial coefficients for the composite control estimate are larger than the corresponding coefficients for the role-specific control estimate in the analysis of the active coping response mode.

In summary, regarding method of calculation of control estimates, no clear superiority of either the role-specific control score or the composite control score for prediction of role specific subjective stress and coping terms is consistently demonstrated across

analyses. However, utilization of the role-specific efficacy estimate is generally preferable to use of the composite efficacy estimate for prediction of role-specific subjective stress or coping terms.

The Rotter I-E Scale--which was designed to be a measure of generalized control expectancies--was attached to half of the questionnaires. Scores on the Rotter I-E Scale are not significantly correlated with any of the role-specific dependent variables ($p > .05$). Details of analyses involving the Rotter I-E Scale are given in Appendix 3 (Tables 43 and 44).

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The model of Lazarus and Launier (1978) specifies that choice of coping mode should be related to the amount of helplessness one perceives in acting to avoid or reduce threat or harm in the environment. Bandura (1977) and Abramson et al. (1978) differentiate beliefs about contingency relationships (i.e., beliefs that outcomes, including reduction of threat, are or are not dependent on responses) from beliefs about self's capacity to execute those responses. Therefore, these models suggest two distinct sources of helplessness. The preceding analyses explored the interrelationships between these two different sources of helplessness and both mode of coping and intensity of emotional distress within everyday life roles. Beliefs about contingency relationships were operationally defined as estimates of the amount of control that people in general have over problems and strains occurring in everyday life roles; and beliefs about efficacy were defined as estimates of whether self can or cannot engage successfully in those actions relative to members of appropriate reference groups--a definition of efficacy based on the model of Abramson et al. (1978).

Pearlin and Schooler (1978) further suggested that the type of threat--i.e., the role area in which the threat occurs--might affect the relationship between choice of coping mode and emotional stress. In interpreting their analyses of stress and coping, they suggested that experiences with control could be different in intensely personal

roles (i.e., marriage and parenting) as contrasted to impersonal economic and occupational roles. Therefore, another purpose of the investigation was to ascertain whether efficacy and control estimates show differential relationships to coping and emotional distress, depending on type of role.

Prior to addressing these interrelationships, analyses were conducted to determine whether the two types of estimates could be distinguished. Factor analyses and comparisons of internal consistency estimates to correlations between control and efficacy scales within each role suggested that control and efficacy expectancies are distinguishable although the two types of estimates were nonorthogonal for a sample of women.

The correlation found between the two types of estimates could reflect a nonspecific and generalized viewpoint that is either negative or positive. In this regard, it was also found that control estimates and efficacy estimates shared variance with perceived intensity of role strain. This shared variance could encompass such a generalized outlook as well as biases in responding to self-report scales. It was of interest to discover whether the two types of estimates were related to coping or subjective stress apart from a more general undifferentiated negative or positive outlook on life which could encompass both one's view of the world, one's personal circumstances, and one's self. Therefore, a multivariate analysis (in which such common variance was not reflected in the term representing each estimate) was used in order to reduce the possibility that any observed associations between either estimate and the coping or stress variables were merely artifacts of such undifferentiated outlooks or general response biases.

Another distinction critical to the research is the distinction between active and passive coping responses. Factor analysis of coping responses in each role area and comparisons of internal consistency estimates to correlations between scales, tended to confirm the active/passive distinction for the sample. Especially in marriage, these analyses suggested that the distinction is best represented by a bipolar active/passive dimension. For instance, in marriage, there was evidence that individuals who saw themselves as frequently searching for fair compromises and opening communication with the spouse when confronted with problems tended to see themselves as not avoiding their spouses, ignoring marital difficulties, minimizing the importance of marital difficulties, or keeping hurt feelings to themselves.

It was hypothesized that both control estimates and efficacy estimates should be independently related to coping responses in all role areas. Specifically, higher control and efficacy estimates should be related to more frequent reported utilization of active coping, and less frequent reported use of passive coping responses. Examination of the regression equations for coping responses in each role suggested that different patterns for different roles emerged. In the intensely personal roles of marriage and parenting it was efficacy--the confidence that self is capable of controlling strains and problems occurring with a spouse or child--that was independently related to reports of coping. Confidence in self's capacity to solve problems (relative to others) in intensely personal areas was related to eschewal of responses that would serve to avoid, ignore, or minimize the problem, and, in marriage, efficacy was related to actively seeking compromise and communication with the spouse.

The correlational nature of the study does not permit a conclusion regarding the best interpretation of this association, and several expressions of the meaning of this association might be appropriate.[26] Bandura (1977) suggests:

> People fear and tend to avoid threatening situations they believe exceed their coping skills, whereas they get involved in activities and behave assuredly when they judge themselves capable of handling situations that would otherwise be intimidating. (p. 94)

In this vein, women confident in their capabilities could tend to seek interaction and compromise, even when confronted with conflicts and problems in marriage, while women lacking confidence avoid interaction. Similarly, in parenting, women lacking confidence in their skills as a parent may tend to ignore and minimize problems with children as a means of avoiding confrontations that they do not believe they can handle. However, as Bandura (1977) points out, it is successful experiences with handling threats and conflicts that are most likely to bolster one's confidence in one's own capabilities. Thus, by avoiding those situations and confrontations in which such successful experiences could occur, women who lack confidence in their capabilities may be deprived of those experiences that could foster confidence. The causal pathways may go in both directions--from self-perceptions to behaviors and from behaviors to self-perceptions.

In parenting, the expected relationship between control

---

[26] Of course, there is no guarantee that actual behavior will correspond to self-reported behavior. Validation of current findings using measures of coping not relying on self-reports would be desirable. Unfortunately, relevant behavioral observations in intensely personal roles are difficult to obtain. One possible approach to validation in marriage would be to assess wife's coping responses by using spouse's reports. In parenting, validation of results regarding use of discipline or other active responses that might be defined could be obtained in observational settings using mothers with young children.

estimates and the passive coping mode was not strongly confirmed by the analysis. Also in parenting, the expected relationship between control estimates and frequency of reported use of discipline was not found. However, examination of several of the items in the discipline scale suggests that the scale may reflect threats of discipline and scolding rather than actual initiation of disciplinary action. Threats of discipline, scolding or restriction of privileges could represent desperation rather than an exercise of control.

In this connection, a general caveat relevant to interpretation of all passive and active responses used in the current study should be made. The particular active and passive responses identified here are not necessarily representative of all possible responses that could be so labeled. The model of coping presented by Lazarus and Launier (1978) suggests that some active responses could be directed toward emotional palliation rather than instrumental ends (i.e., elimination of threat). Such pallitative responses could not be expected to show the same relationship to control or efficacy that active solution-oriented responses would be expected to show. Indeed, the discipline response in parenting is substantially different in content from that of the active response in occupation and the active items in marriage, as both of the latter involve seeking solutions to problems through initiation of communication, seeking compromise, and initiating action specifically oriented toward solving the problem. If an active response in parenting resembling those in marriage and occupation had been defined, relationships might be more in line with the expectation that higher control or efficacy estimates would be associated with more

frequent utilization of the active response.

In the role of economic management there was a tendency (not strongly replicated) for low control expectancies to be associated with more frequent employment of passive modes of coping (involving selective ignoring and passive acceptance of financial strains). However, in contrast to passive coping in personal roles, analyses fail to suggest a significant independent association of perceived efficacy and passive coping in the economic sphere, although a relation between estimated control and passive coping is suggested. In occupation, the strongest correlate of passive coping was occupational status. Women of lower occupational status more frequently attempted to ignore problems and minimize the importance of the work role. If status is a rough indicator of real control contingencies, the finding could be interpreted to suggest that such disassociation from the work role reflects a real deficit of control over that area of life. Regarding the two types of estimates (control and efficacy), the pattern of association between each estimate and passive coping tended to be unstable across samples in occupation. In occupation, a relationship between control estimates and active coping was suggested although the relationship was not replicated. The estimation that occupational problems are potentially amenable to personal control was associated with a higher reported frequency of seeking communication with others to solve problems and acting to achieve solutions. In contrast to the marital role, efficacy played a less pronounced role than control in active coping in occupation, and a significant association of efficacy and active coping, independent of the other factors, was not demonstrated.

In summary, for the specified sample of women, efficacy

estimates derived from social comparisons tended to be related to reported frequency of passive coping in intensely personal roles but not in occupational or economic spheres, while estimated control tended to be related to coping mode (with the exception of passive coping in occupation) in the impersonal spheres.

An alternative interpretation of the finding that efficacy derived from social comparisons is related to reported frequency of passive coping attempts only in intensely personal roles is suggested by a distinction between interpersonal problems, and problems that do not, of necessity, involve another person (George and Seigler [Note 2]) Perusal of the stress, strain, and coping items in marriage and parenting (Appendix 1) shows that all of these variables are defined as necessarily involving another person. On the other hand, in occupation and economic management, most stress, strain, and coping items refer to problems which may or may not involve another person (i.e., interpersonal problems and problems relating only to the individual are confounded in the two impersonal roles). Possibly, the modes of coping and efficacy based on social comparisons tend to be related in the context of interpersonal problems. If coping responses specific to interpersonal problems occurring in occupational or economic roles had been defined, a relationship between efficacy based on social comparisons and mode of coping might have been found.

Regarding role specific subjective stress, differential predictions for the relationship between control estimates and subjective stress were made for intensely personal as contrasted to impersonal roles. It was expected that control would be independently related to intensity of stress in intensely personal roles only. Also, interaction

of estimated control and passive coping were hypothesized with respect to subjective stress in impersonal roles. On the other hand, it was expected that low efficacy estimates would be related to high levels of subjective stress, regardless of role area.

In two of the four roles--parenting and economic management--low efficacy estimates were related to high levels of subjective stress, as expected. Also, frequent use of passive coping response modes in both intensely personal roles tended to be related to more intense subjective stress--a confirmation of the findings of Pearlin and Schooler (1978). In marriage, an association between efficacy and subjective stress was due in large part to shared variance with perceived strain and active/passive coping. (In marriage, the strongest relationship between efficacy and coping response mode was seen.)

In contrast to other roles, no consistent relationship between estimates of efficacy, coping, and subjective stress was found in occupation. Possibly, opportunities for social comparisons involving efficacy are unique in the occupational role. (The definition of efficacy is based on social comparisons.) It might be expected that both the opportunity for and the type of social comparisons made in the occupational role differ substantially from those in other roles. At work usually one is in frequent contact with a limited group of coworkers and frequently may have opportunities to directly observe the efficacy with which other people handle occupational strains and problems. Also, in the occupational role, the impact of estimated efficacy could be dependent on whether the estimate is derived from vertical or lateral comparisons. The expectation that coworkers of higher status are more capable of handling strains or problems has

different implications for impinging emotional distress from the belief that coworkers of equal or lower status are more capable than self of dealing with occupational problems and strains.

In occupation, only the magnitude of perceived strain (involving the extent of work overload, pressure to keep up with innovations, treatment by coworkers, dangerous or unpleasant conditions, adequacy of job rewards, and job security) was independently related to the intensity of stress. Neither passive nor active coping in occupation was significantly associated with role stress independently of the other factors, especially role strain.[27] Pearlin and Schooler (1978) suggested that coping responses are not materially associated with the amelioration of emotional distress attending occupational strain, nor are psychological resources (reflecting global perceptions of mastery and self-esteem) as important in accounting for the extent of distress in occupation as compared to other roles. Current analyses are in accord with this suggestion. Neither choice of coping mode nor estimated control nor estimated efficacy contributed to prediction of the intensity of subjective stress once the perceived level of role strain was known.

Regarding control estimates, it was hypothesized that the perception of lack of control would be related to more intense stress, independently of role strain, only in intensely personal roles. Support for this prediction is at best tenuous, and only marginally supported in a single personal role--marriage.

---

[27] Of course utilization of certain coping responses could actually influence the level of environmental strain. Such relationships cannot be addressed in the context of current analyses. Pearlin and Schooler (1978) further address this problem.

In economic management, low efficacy estimates were related to higher levels of subjective stress. In keeping with Pearlin and Schooler's findings (Pearlin and Schooler, 1978), and in contrast to the two intensely personal roles, more frequent (reported) passive coping attempts tended to be related to lower levels of subjective stress; however, the net association between reported frequency of passive coping and subjective stress was statistically significant in only one sample. Therefore, the relation between passive coping and stress in economics must be regarded as tenuous. It was also hypothesized that the term for passive coping frequency would act as a suppressor variable, and that estimated control and subjective stress would be related after passive coping frequency was taken into account. While the directional relationships among passive coping, control estimates, and objective stress were as expected, no strong evidence for the hypothesized effect was found.

Generally, findings suggest that a woman in the sample was less likely to be distressed if she saw her own capabilities for solving role problems as at least equal to the capacity of relevant others without regard to the magnitude of strain perceived in the environment or her belief about the amount of control that people in general can exert over role problems. In intensely personal roles, women who expressed little confidence in their own capacities relative to others were more likely to report frequent coping attempts involving ignoring, withdrawal, and avoidance of communication when confronted with role problems. In turn such coping responses involving ignoring of problems, withdrawal from problems, and avoidance of communication when confronted with problems were associated with more intense subjective stress. As with coping, the observed relationship between efficacy estimates and

subjective stress could be interpreted in several ways. On the one hand, the state of insecurity about one's own capabilities relative to others may exacerbate levels of subjective distress attending environmental threat. As Bandura (1977) points out, the assessment that one is anxious or distressed can be a "source of information that can affect efficacy expectations," (p. 198).

Indeed, efficacy was found to be related to the more global psychological variable of depression and global perceptions of self-esteem, independently of control estimates, while estimated control (i.e., a composite of control estimates from all roles) was not significantly related to self-esteem or to depression after estimated efficacy was taken into account. Abramson et al. (1978) suggested that both relative efficacy (i.e., "personal helplessness") and perceived control should be related to depression. In the present series of studies, only efficacy estimates were directly and independently related to depression scores and to self-esteem.

In summary, for the specified sample, efficacy estimates were significant predictors of reported frequency of employment of coping response modes involving selective ignoring of problems, avoidance of communication when problems occur, and eschewal of involvement in the fact of problems in intensely personal marital and parental roles. Also, low efficacy estimates were associated with (a) high levels of subjective stress in economic management and parental roles, (b) high depression scores, and (c) low estimates of self-esteem. Estimates regarding the amount of control people in general have over role strains and problems tended to be useful predictors of coping response modes in impersonal economic management and occupational roles (with the exception of passive coping modes in occupation).

APPENDIX 1

ITEM KEY

Efficacy items, control items, coping items, strain items, and stress items (with scale designations) are listed in the following key. Coping items, stress items, and strain items are based on Pearlin and Schooler's items (Pearlin and Schooler, 1978). The original name of the factor from the Pearlin and Schooler Study (1978) is given beside each coping item.

Marriage Efficacy (ME)

ME1 Even when problems occur, I am as capable of controlling what happens in my marriage as most other married people that I know.

ME2 I am probably not as skillful as most other people are when it comes to resolving marital problems.

ME3 My husband is more capable than I am when it comes to resolving marital problems.

ME4 I am as capable a marriage partner as my spouse.

ME5 Even under strain, I am as capable of controlling what happens in my marriage as anyone could be under the circumstances.

ME6 I am capable as anyone else would be of taking action to get rid of marital tensions.

ME7 I often feel that I can't resolve marital problems as well as other married people I know.

Occupation Efficacy (OE)

OE1 Sometimes I think I can't resolve job problems as well as my fellow employees.

OE2 Job pressures and problems that I experience are often due to the fact that I am not as capable of controlling what happens on the job as other people would be.

OE3 If I'm being treated unfairly on the job, I am as competent and capable as anyone else would be of changing the situation.

OE4 Even when I'm under a lot of pressure on the job, I am at least as good at solving job problems as the other people at work.

OE5 When job problems occur, I seem to be at least as skillful at solving them as most of the other people that I work with.

Economic Management Efficacy (EE)

EE1 I am not as capable of controlling my expenses as other people that I know.

EE2 I lack the skills which permit most people to solve money problems.

EE3 Even when money problems occur, I am as skillful as anyone else at dealing with them.

EE4 I handle money as well as most people I know.

EE5 I am not as capable of avoiding many financial problems as other people seem to be.

Parenting Efficacy (PE)

PE1 When my child gets into trouble or has problems, I seem to be less capable of changing his(her) behavior than other parents would be under the same circumstances.

PE2 I can't handle conflicts with my children as well as other parents probably could.

PE3 When my child seems to ignore my advice, often I think that I am not as skillful a parent as other people.

PE4 I am as capable as most people of altering my child's beliefs and values if I find them objectionable.

PE5 I am at least as capable as most other parents would be of acting to resolve problems my child may have in school.

Economic Management Control (EC)

EC1 Often there aren't many things that the typical person at my income level can do to get rid of money problems.

EC2 Most financial pressures are caused by factors that people cannot control.

EC3 The average person doesn't have much control when confronted with money problems.

EC4 The majority of people at my income level do not have the power to control many of the financial strains that they experience.

EC5 It is often impossible for people at my income level to find ways to afford many needed items.

EC6 Under ordinary circumstances the average person has the power to solve most financial problems.

EC7 If someone really puts her(his) mind to it, she(he) can almost always improve a poor financial situation.

Parenting Control (PC)

PC1 When problems with children occur, most parents find it impossible to exert a great deal of control over their children's behavior.

PC2 When a child gets into trouble, most parents can't do anything to prevent it from happening again.

PC3 Almost all conflicts between a parent and child can be solved if the parent tries hard enough.

PC4 If a child is not motivated to achieve and do well in life, there is not much that most parents can do about it.

PC5 Most parents have the power to change their child's behavior, even when the child seems to ignore parental advice.

PC6 Communications problems between a parent and child often cannot be resolved.

PC7 A parent can always do something to resolve problems that a child is having in school.

Marriage Control (MC)

MC1 There are many marital problems that can't be solved.

MC2 If a husband's habits are causing problems in a marriage, the average wife can probably do something to influence her husband to change.

MC3 Whether or not marital problems improve depends mostly on the effort that each spouse puts into the marriage.

MC4 When communications problems develop in a marriage, there is almost always something that a spouse can do to correct them.

MC5 Many strains upon a marriage cannot be changed by the average spouse.

MC6 A spouse usually has very little control over marital conflicts.

MC7 Most marital difficulties can be resolved if a spouse is willing to work at it.

MC8 It is seldom possible to change bad aspects of a marriage

Occupation Control (OC)

OC1 An employee does not have the power to get rid of most types of job stresses.

OC2 An employee who believes that she(he) is being treated unfairly can do something about it.

OC3 An employee usually has the power to get rid of unpleasant working conditions.

OC4 If someone is not receiving adequate pay for the kind of job she(he) is doing, there is almost always something that she(he) can do about it.

OC5 An employee in a position similar to mine cannot take direct action to get rid of many job problems.

OC6 Most employees have to put up with unfair treatment--often there is nothing that can be done about it.

OC7 There are very few job problems that an employee cannot solve if she(he) really tries.

OC8 If an employee doesn't receive the recognition that she(he) deserves there probably isn't much that she (he) can do about it.

Coping Responses in Marriage (MAct, MPas)

MAct1 How often do you try to find a fair compromise in marriage problems? "Negotiation"

MAct2 How often do you sit down and talk things out? "Negotiation"

MPas1	How often do you tell yourself that marital difficulties are not important?	"Selective Ignoring"
MPas2	How often do you wait for time to remedy the difficulty?	"Selective Ignoring"
MPas3	How often do you keep so busy you don't have time to think about the difficulty?	"Selective Ignoring"
MPas4	How often do you try to overlook your spouse's faults and pay attention only to good points?	"Selective Ignoring"
MPas5	How often do you try to ignore difficulties by looking only at the good things?	"Selective Ignoring"
MPas6	How often do you keep out of your spouse's way for awhile when you have differences?	"Forebearance"
MPas7	How often do you give in more than halfway when you and your spouse have differences?	"Forebearance"
MPas8	How often do you just keep hurt feelings to yourself when you and your spouse have differences?	"Forebearance"

Coping Responses in Economic Management (EPas)

EPas1	When you are short of money how often do you notice people around who are worse off than you?	"Selective Ignoring"
EPas2	When you are short of money, how often do you just accept the money pinch because there's little you can do about it?	"Selective Ignoring" and "Optimistic Faith"
EPas3	When you are short of money, how often do you just tell yourself that money isn't worth getting upset about?	"Selective Ignoring"
EPas4	When you are short of money, how often do you just think about more important things in life?	"Selective Ignoring"
EPas5	When you are short of money how often do you just sit back and wait for things to work out by themselves?	"Optimistic Faith"
EPas6	How do you think your standard of living will compare in a year or two to the one you have now?	"Optimistic Faith"

Coping Responses: Occupation (OPas, OAct)

OAct1	How often do you talk to others to find a solution to difficulties on the job?	"Optimistic Action"
OAct2	How often do you take some action to get rid of the difficulties in your work situation?	"Optimistic Action"
OAct3	How often do you notice people who have more difficulties on the job than you do?	"Optimistic Action"
OPas1	How often do you just wait for difficulties on the job to work themselves out?	"Selective Ignoring"
OPas2	How often do you remind yourself that for everything bad about your work situation there is also something good?	"Selective Ignoring"
OPas3	How often do you tell yourself that difficulties at work are not important to you?	"Selective Ignoring"
OPas4	How often do you try to pay attention only to your duties in order to overlook difficulties in the work situation?	"Selective Ignoring"
OPas5	The most important thing about my job is that it provides me the things I need in life.	"Substitution of Rewards"
OPas6	Time solves most problems on my job.	"Substitution of Rewards"
OPas7	I have to accept my job as it is because there's nothing I can do to change it.	"Substitution of Rewards"
OPas8	I can put up with a lot on my job as long as the pay is good.	"Substitution of Rewards"
OPas9	As soon as I leave work, I put it out of my mind.	"Substitution of Rewards"
OPas10	I don't really expect to get much pleasure out of work.	"Substitution of Rewards"

Coping Responses: Parenting (PPas and PAct)

PAct1	When your children's behavior is troublesome, how often do you take away a privilege?	"Discipline"
PAct2	When your children's behavior is troublesome, how often do you threaten some kind of punishment?	"Discipline"
PAct3	When your children's behavior is troublesome, how often do you scold them?	"Discipline"

PPas1	When your children misbehave, how often do you think that it's behavior that they will just outgrow?	"Selective Ignoring"
PPas2	How often do you ignore what's going on when there is something troublesome in your children's behavior?	"Selective Ignoring"
PPas3	How often do you tell yourself that something in your children's behavior is not really important?	"Selective Ignoring"
PPas4	How often do you look around at other parents to see how much better off you are than they?	"Selective Ignoring"
PPas5	How often do you decide there's nothing you can do to change things about your child?	"Selective Ignoring" and "Resignation"
PPas6	When your child's behavior is troublesome, how often do you remind yourself that things could be worse?	"Selective Ignoring"
PPas7	How often do you try to notice only the good things about your child?	"Selective Ignoring"
PPas8	The way my children are turning out depends on their inner nature and there is little I can do about it.	"Resignation"
PPas9	There is only so much I can do as a parent and after that I just accept my children as they are.	"Resignation"

Economic Strain

1. How often are you unable to afford the kind of clothing you should have?

2. How do your finances work out at the end of the month?

3. How often are you unable to afford the kind of food you should have?

4. At the present time, how easy would it be for you to afford the furniture or household equipment that needs to be replaced?

5. How often are you unable to afford the leisure activities that you want?

6. How many problems do you have in meeting the monthly payments on bills?

Parental Strain

1. How often do your children fail to get along with others the same age?
2. How often do you give attention to carelessness about your child's personal appearance?
3. How often do you have to give attention to your children's poor use of spare time?
4. How often do you have to give attention to poor school work?
5. How often do you have to give attention to your children having the wrong kind of friends?
6. How often do you wonder if your children are not practicing the moral beliefs that are important?
7. How often do you wonder if your children are trying hard enough to prepare for the life ahead of them?
8. How often does it happen that you are treated without proper respect by your children?
9. How often does it happen that your advice and guidance are ignored by your children?

Marital Strain

1. Generally, I give in more to my husband's wishes than he gives in to mine.
2. My spouse insists on having his own way.
3. My spouse usually expects more from me than he is willing to give back.
4. My spouse is someone who is a good wage earner.
5. I cannot completely be myself around my spouse.
6. My marriage doesn't give me enough opportunity to become the sort of person I'd like to be.

Occupational Strain

1. At work, how often do you have more work than you can handle?
2. At work, how often are you under pressure to keep up with new ways of doing things?
3. At work how often are you treated unfairly by another person?
4. At work, how often do people treat you in an unfriendly way?
5. At work, how often do people act toward you as if you are a person without real feelings?
6. Are you in danger of illness or injury on the job?
7. Do you work in a lot of dirt or dust?
8. Do you have a lot of noise on the job?
9. My work has good fringe benefits such as sick pay and retirement.
10. I can count on a steady income.

Economic Stress

When you think of your financial situation, do you feel:

1. WORRIED?
2. CONTENTED?
3. BOTHERED OR UPSET?
4. UNHAPPY?
5. TENSE?
6. INSECURE?
7. FRUSTRATED?
8. RELAXED?

Parental Stress

When you think of your experiences as a parent, do you feel:

1. UNSURE OF YOURSELF?
2. FRUSTRATED?
3. WORRIED?
4. EMOTIONALLY WORN OUT?
5. BOTHERED OR UPSET?
6. TENSE?
7. UNHAPPY?

Marital Stress

When you think of daily life with your husband, do you feel:

1. RELAXED?
2. WORRIED?
3. NEGLECTED?
4. BORED?
5. CONTENTED?
6. BOTHERED OR UPSET?
7. TENSE?
8. FRUSTRATED?
9. UNHAPPY?

Occupational Stress

When you think of your day-to-day job, do you feel:

1. RELAXED?
2. CONTENTED?
3. WORRIED?
4. BOTHERED OR UPSET?
5. TENSE?
6. UNHAPPY?
7. FRUSTRATED?

APPENDIX 2

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR THE PILOT STUDY

Descriptions of Instruments Included in the Questionnaire

Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale

The Crowne-Marlowe SDS (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960) was developed as a measure of socially desirable response set that would be independent of psychopathology. Characteristics of the scale were originally estimated on the basis of administration of the scale to a sample of undergraduates. An internal consistency estimate of .88 (K-R 20) and a test-retest reliability of .89 was reported (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960). While modestly correlated with the Edwards SDS (r = .35) and MMPI validity scales, the correlations between clinical MMPI Scales and the Crowne-Marlowe SDS were generally low (p > .05). The Crowne-Marlowe SDS has received wide usage as a measure of response set in the literature on control expectancies (e.g., Levenson, 1974; Rotter, 1966; Wallston et al., 1976). Correlations between control instruments and Crowne-Marlowe SDS vary across samples and settings. For instance, correlations ranging from .02 to -.40 are reported between the Rotter I-E Scale and the SDS. Also, correlations between control scales and SDS tend to be higher for females than for males (Rotter, 1966).

Beck Depression Inventory (Abbreviated Form)

The abbreviated form of the BDI contains 13 items derived from the widely used 22 item BDI. Split-half reliabilities above .9 have been reported for the long version (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, 1961). Also, the abbreviated form of the BDI was highly correlated with the longer version (*r* = .96). Both the longer version and the abbreviated version were highly correlated with clinicians' ratings of depression in inpatient psychiatric samples (Beck and Beck, 1972).

Use of Role Importance Weights for Calculation of Composite Efficacy and Control Scores

Some theorists have argued that outcome importance should be taken into account when evaluating control expectancies (Rotter et al., 1972), and others have suggested that depression is more likely to be associated with highly valued outcomes (Roth and Kubal, 1975); therefore, use of role importance ratings as weights for role specific efficacy or control estimates might increase the correlation between depression and such estimates. However, Stotland (1969) has suggested that depression may result from devaluation of important outcomes, therefore, a low role-importance rating could reflect devaluation--a condition under which low control or efficacy estimates could be associated with depression. The role importance ratings from the pilot study cannot be used to distinguish between devalued and simply unimportant roles.

In order to determine whether use of role importance ratings as weights altered the association between control or efficacy estimates and depression, composite control scores and composite efficacy scores were computed using two different methods of weighting role specific

estimates by role importance. Using Method 1, each role estimate was weighted by the corresponding mean for the role importance rating. Using Method 2, each role estimate was weighted using the corresponding role importance rating for the individual subject. Partial correlations between depression (BDI) scores and each composite were computed. Using Method 1, the correlations between the weighted composite control scale and BDI (_r_ control, BDI.SDS = .25), and the weighted composite efficacy scale and BDI (_r_ efficacy, BDI.SDS = .34) were virtually identical to the corresponding correlations between the unweighted composites and BDI. However, use of the second weighting method substantially reduced the correlations between the composites and BDI (_r_ control, BDI.SDS = .08; _r_ efficacy, BDI.SDS = .15). The failure of role importance weights to increase the correlations between efficacy or control scores and depression might reflect the failure of the importance weights to distinguish between devalued and simply unimportant outcomes. (Of course, weights based on multi-item importance scales for each role would be preferable to single item weights.)

TABLE 41

ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS OF ORDER OF SCALE ADMINISTRATION ON EFFICACY AND CONTROL SCALE SCORES

	F	p [a]
Control		
Occupation	.193	.90
Parenting	.168	.92
Economics	1.165	.29
Marriage	.773	.53
Efficacy		
Occupation	1.714	.17
Parenting	.818	.49
Economics	1.431	.24
Marriage	.924	.43

[a] Two-tailed probability

APPENDIX 3

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR THE FINAL STUDY

Calculation of Occupational Status Scores

Duncan's Socioeconomic Status Index was used as the measure of occupational status. The index was developed as an extension of NORC occupational prestige scores (Miller, and Duncan, 1977; Reiss, 1961). In addition to subjective occupational prestige ratings, percentage of high school graduates in the occupation, and the average 1949 income level for the occupation were used in deriving weights for each occupation. The index is correlated with both education ($r > .8$), and with other occupational indices (Miller, 1977). In the present study, subjects responded to a question asking for a short description of their job. Scores based on Duncan's Index were assigned on the basis of this information.

Calculation of Parental Strain Scores

The age of the youngest and eldest child was calculated for each respondent with children. Items included in the parental strain score depended on the age of the children. Items dealing with school work, carelessness of appearance, use of spare time, and failure to get along with other children were omitted for parents whose youngest child was over 21. Items dealing with school, moral beliefs, type of friends, preparation for life, respect, and ignoring parental advice were omitted for women whose eldest child was younger than 6, and items dealing with

TABLE 42

ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ROLE SPECIFIC CONTROL AND EFFICACY SCALES, AND CORRESPONDING ROLE SPECIFIC COPING RESPONSES AND STRESS

	Efficacy (_r_)	Control (_r_)
Stress		
Marriage		
Sample 1	.502**	.653**
Sample 2	.428**	.208*
Total	.456**	.469**
Parenting		
Sample 1	.456**	.268**
Sample 2	.396**	.295**
Total	.436**	.283**
Occupation		
Sample 1	.109	.275**
Sample 2	.344**	.035
Total	.205*	.171*
Economics		
Sample 1	.485**	.311**
Sample 2	.544**	.467**
Total	.516**	.388**
Active Coping		
Occupation		
Sample 1	-.104	-.069
Sample 2	-.134	-.352**
Total	-.114	-.203**

TABLE 42-Continued

	Efficacy (r)	Control (r)
Active Coping		
Parenting	-.010	.056
Passive Coping		
Marriage		
Sample 1	.459**	.352**
Sample 2	.468**	.229*
Total	.467**	.287**
Parenting		
Sample 1	.310**	.346**
Sample 2	.314**	.219*
Total	.300**	.285**
Occupation		
Sample 1	.308**	.158
Sample 2	.133	.301**
Total	.233**	.229**
Economics		
Sample 1	.183	.199*
Sample 2	.137	.287**
Total	.156	.247**

NOTE: N for each r corresponds to that tabled for the corresponding regression analyses (Tables 28-37).

*$p < .05$ (one-tailed)

**$p < .01$ (one-tailed)

moral beliefs and preparation for life were omitted for parents whose eldest child was younger than 10. (Parental strain items are listed in Appendix 1.)

Relationships Between the Rotter I-E Scale and Role Specific Scales

It has been suggested that use of scales measuring specific rather than generalized control expectancies is justified if use of the specific scale improves predictions involving area specific variables (Phares, 1975; Rotter, 1975; Wallston et al., 1976). In order to compare the utility of area-specific scales to a generalized control scale (i.e., the Rotter I-E Scale) in predicting stress and coping variables, the Rotter Scale was included in alternate questionnaires. Exactly 92 questionnaires containing the Rotter I-E Scale were returned, and 87 of the 92 could be scored. (In five questionnaires, more than 60% of the Rotter items were not answered.)

Scores on the Rotter I-E Scale correlated significantly with the occupational control scale ($p < .05$), and were marginally correlated with economic control scores (Table 42). However, Rotter I-E Scores were not correlated with control scales in marriage and parenting or with any of the efficacy scales (Table 42). Because the Rotter Scale contains items involving occupation (but no items involving the three other roles), this pattern of correlation is not surprising. Scores on the Rotter I-E Scale were significantly correlated with age ($p < .05$). Older women obtained lower scores (indicative of higher internal control expectancies). However, the Rotter I-E Scale was not significantly correlated with any of the role-specific coping or subjective stress scores (Table 43). In contrast, several role-specific control scales

TABLE 43

CORRELATIONS (PEARSON'S r) BETWEEN THE ROTTER I-E SCALE, AND ROLE EFFICACY AND CONTROL SCALES, AND OTHER VARIABLES

	r	N
Control		
Occupation	.199*	85
Economics	.147	85
Marriage	.054	84
Parenting	.016	82
Efficacy		
Occupation	.034	68
Economics	.018	80
Marriage	.046	59
Parenting	-.139	43
Income	.015	80
Education	-.048	80
Age	-.210*	82
SDS	-.156	82
Self-esteem	-.120	76

*$p < .05$ (The test was one-tailed for control scales because it was expected that control scales should be positively correlated with the Rotter I-E Scale.)

were significantly correlated with corresponding coping or stress variables in the sample of respondents receiving the Rotter I-E Scale--generally, replicating results for the total sample (Table 43). Role-specific control scales appear to be superior to the Rotter I-E Scale in accounting for role-specific stress and coping scores.

TABLE 44

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE ROTTER I-E SCALE AND ROLE SPECIFIC DEPENDENT VARIABLES COMPARED TO PARALLEL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ROLE SPECIFIC CONTROL SCALES AND ROLE SPECIFIC DEPENDENT VARIABLES

	Rotter I-E	Role Specific Control Scales			
		Occupation	Economics	Parenting	Marriage
	r	r	r	r	r
Occupation (N=59)					
Passive Coping	-.005	.148			
Active Coping	.060	-.212*			
Stress	.147	.200*			
Economics (N=73)					
Passive Coping	.118		.080		
Stress	.048		.634**		
Parenting (N=40)					
Passive Coping	-.148			-.092	
Discipline	-.046			.067	
Stress	-.055			.132	
Marriage (N=55)					
Active/ Passive Coping	.077				.244**
Stress	.035				.595**

*$p < .05$ (one-tailed)

**$p < .01$ (one-tailed)

TABLE 45

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF SEPARATE ACTIVE AND PASSIVE SCALES IN MARRIAGE

	Passive Items Alone			Active Items Alone		
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Total	Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Control	-.096	-.145	-.121	-.114	-.259	-.127
	-.104	-.120	-.113	-.197	-.176	-.098
	.655	1.017	1.818	.442	2.693	1.223
SDS	-.371	-.050	-.025	.037	-.000	.003
	-.021	-.274	-.138	.164	-.002	.059
	.037	5.361**	3.122	1.796	.000	.521
Education	.016	.047	.025	-.001	.034	.017
	.047	.124	.068	-.002	.074	.039
	.192	1.058	.730	.000	.467	.210
Income	.095	-.063	.011	.156	-.078	.011
	.146	-.077	.015	.191	-.079	.012
	1.516	.423	.033	1.993	.550	.022
Age	.010	.028	.018	-.016	.010	-.003
	.115	.286	.189	-.148	.082	-.027
	1.132	6.099**	5.970**	1.472	.612	.114
Efficacy	.275	.232	.301	-.286	-.431	-.356
	.257	.217	.257	-.212	-.330	-.269
	4.862**	2.985	9.489**	2.545	8.546**	9.344**
Strain	.349	.331	.309	.002	-.373	-.214
	.498	.424	.411	.002	-.397	-.233
	14.047**	13.900**	24.359**	000	14.768**	7.045**

NOTE: Ns for the above analyses equal those tabled for corresponding analyses in Table 27. For each entry, b, beta, and F value are listed consecutively.

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

TABLE 46

BETAS FOR EFFICACY AFTER SELF-ESTEEM ENTERS EACH OF FOUR REGRESSION EQUATIONS

	Betas for Efficacy		
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Total
Regression			
Economics			
Stress (Table 37)	.253**	.334**	.287**
Parenting			
Stress (Table 35)	.389**	.160	.278**
Passive Coping (Table 28)	.233	.265*	.237**
Marriage			
Active/ Passive Coping (Table 27)	.307**	.280**	.314**

NOTE: _N_ for each beta corresponds to that tabled for the corresponding analysis in the appropriate table (given in parentheses).

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

APPENDIX 4

SUPPLEMENTARY REGRESSION TABLES

The following tables give details regarding entry of variables into regression equations reported in preceding tables (Tables 28 through 39). By following the steps, changes in net contribution of any variable as other variables enter the equation can be examined. Efficacy and strain entered on successive steps because, in several cases, intercorrelations among efficacy estimates, control estimates, and strain were modestly high (Tables 17 and 27).[28] Entry of efficacy and strain on separate steps permitted examination of secondary issues involving variance shared by control, efficacy, strain, and the criterion. It should be noted that all conclusions were drawn on the basis of the final equation, and earlier steps were used only to address secondary issues.

For all regression analyses involving stress, passive coping was entered on the final step because differential predictions were made regarding changes in net contribution of control with entry of passive coping in impersonal as opposed to personal roles. However, no evidence for the hypothesized relationships was found. (This is discussed in preceding sections.)

For the following tables, Ns correspond to those in the corresponding regression tables (Tables 28 through 39). At each step, DF for each coefficient equals 1 (denominator) and the number of cases

---

[28] In some instances, intercorrelations among control, efficacy, and strain exceeded the correlations of control or efficacy estimates with criterion variables. Interpretation of partial regression coefficients for intercorrelated variables under these circumstances can be problematic (Darlington, 1968; Nie, 1970).

minus the number of predictor variables in the equation. Indicators of significance levels are the same as those used in all preceding tables. Unstandardized (b) coefficients, standardized coefficients (beta), and F values are listed consecutively for each entry in each of the following tables.

TABLE 47

ACTIVE/PASSIVE COPING IN MARRIAGE: SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 28

	Sample 1			Sample 2			Total		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Control	.258	.098	-.056	.219	-.009	-.058	.222	.050	-.068
	.298	.122	-.072	.199	-.008	-.052	.238	.053	-.073
	6.507**	.996	.347	2.694	.004	.226	8.522**	.407	.851
SDS	-.025	-.019	-.009	-.048	-.040	-.041	-.036	-.028	-.023
	-.162	-.127	-.060	-.290	-.236	-.246	-.222	-.165	-.143
	1.864	1.297	1.336	4.054*	3.568	5.062*	6.554**	4.728*	3.802
Education	.012	.182	.115	.137	.167	.034	.011	.015	.021
	.039	.060	.038	.039	.047	.010	.035	.046	.054
	.106	.285	.136	.081	.113	.785	.799	.310	.000
Income	-.004	-.030	.039	-.071	-.032	-.039	-.052	-.040	.017
	-.008	-.052	.070	-.094	-.042	-.053	-.081	-.062	.001
	.005	.194	.383	.485	.141	.223	.152	.552	.535
Age	.012	.013	.012	.018	.019	.021	.014	.016	.016
	.146	.174	.159	.200	.215	.238	.168	.188	.187
	1.493	2.364	2.348	2.218*	3.074	4.896*	3.759	5.501*	6.691**
Efficacy		.353	.259		.435	.282		.399	.290
		.382	.280		.445	.289		.417	.304
		10.302**	6.205**		12.326**	6.141**		24.979**	15.171**
Strain			.289			.329			.290
			.478			.461			.432
			13.879**			19.138**			30.729**

TABLE 48

PASSIVE COPING IN PARENTING: SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 29

	Sample 1			Sample 2			Total		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Control	.257	.154	.120	.152	.098	.084	.208	.139	.115
	.254	.152	.118	.199	.129	.110	.233	.155	.128
	3.435	1.131	.666	1.894	.779	.654	6.271**	2.708	1.902
SDS	.001	-.001	-.001	-.032	-.025	-.024	-.016	-.013	-.012
	.008	-.008	-.004	-.258	-.205	-.199	-.110	-.086	-.079
	.003	.004	.001	2.882	1.870	1.991	1.203	.782	.690
Education	.105	.118	.123	.046	.058	.051	.079	.090	.090
	.300	.336	.351	.180	.227	.197	.260	.296	.295
	4.282*	5.585**	6.073**	1.234	2.007	1.174	6.160**	8.410**	8.742**
Income	-.129	-.106	-.096	-.131	-.107	-.075	-.136	-.114	-.097
	-.189	-.156	-.141	-.238	-.194	-.137	-.221	-.185	-.157
	1.853	1.309	1.062	2.348	1.600	.893	5.064**	3.703	2.750
Age	.017	.016	.020	.018	.018	.030	.019	.018	.024
	.173	.168	.207	.226	.237	.388	.211	.204	.275
	1.439	1.430	2.051	2.770	3.202	8.215**	4.870**	4.844**	8.439**
Efficacy		.259	.250		.201	.268		.222	.206
		.262	.252		.265	.242		.256	.238
		3.809	3.564		3.541	3.371		7.761**	7.007**
Strain			.129			.387			.181
			.152			.366			.225
			1.344			7.612**			6.330**

TABLE 49

ACTIVE COPING (DISCIPLINE) IN PARENTING: SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 31

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Control	.231	.266	.258
	.177	.203	.197
	2.171	2.332	2.463
SDS	.034	.032	.044
	.142	.134	.182
	1.153	1.012	2.022
Education	-.188	-.192	-.157
	-.388	-.397	-.324
	7.515**	7.620**	5.450*
Income	.203	.202	.260
	.220	.219	.280
	3.196	3.112	5.527*
Age	-.085	-.084	-.068
	-.437	-.432	-.350
	13.831**	13.195**	9.022**
Efficacy		-.081	-.222
		-.060	-.166
		.225	1.715
Strain			.442
			.335
			7.075**

TABLE 50

PASSIVE COPING IN OCCUPATION: SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 32

	Sample 1			Sample 2			Total		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Control	-.018	-.052	-.078	.138	.139	.156	.083	.060	.048
	-.021	-.061	-.091	.178	.172	.193	.101	.072	.058
	.029	.252	.631	1.558	1.481	1.851	1.335	.663	.430
SDS	-.017	-.020	-.012	-.029	-.030	-.031	-.022	-.022	-.019
	-.119	-.141	-.080	-.184	-.185	-.197	-.147	-.143	-.125
	.905	1.311	.464	2.167	2.094	2.377	2.748	2.662	2.005
Education	.057	.039	.032	.093	.093	.106	.067	.062	.056
	.185	.127	.104	.314	.314	.359	.223	.207	.186
	1.058	.516	.387	3.615	3.548	4.447*	3.304	3.044	2.450
Income	-.150	-.119	-.113	.068	.067	.062	-.047	-.030	-.026
	-.267	-.211	-.201	.080	.113	.104	-.082	-.053	-.044
	4.513*	2.187	2.884	.718	.671	.572	.856	.346	.247
Age	-.001	.001	.002	-.013	-.013	-.016	-.005	-.005	-.004
	-.007	.006	.023	-.158	-.158	-.194	-.067	-.060	-.047
	.003	.002	.040	1.458	1.431	2.078	.582	.467	.278
Occupational Status	-.013	-.013	-.010	-.021	-.021	-.023	-.016	-.016	-.014
	-.290	-.277	-.215	-.479	-.480	-.536	-.359	-.355	-.318
	2.654	2.544	1.708	7.030**	6.899**	8.159**	8.696**	8.628**	6.768**
Efficacy		.207	.186		-.003	.019		.126	.117
		.245	.220		-.003	.018		.142	.132
		4.254**	3.859		.001	.023		2.757	2.389
Strain			.290			-.185			.133
			.337			-.163			.138
			9.320**			1.458			2.553

TABLE 51

ACTIVE COPING IN OCCUPATION: SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 33

	Sample 1			Sample 2			Total		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Control	-.120	-.107	-.118	-.306	-.269	-.310	-.259	-.240	-.258
	-.092	-.080	-.089	-.275	-.242	-.279	-.211	-.195	-.211
	.555	.416	.501	3.799	2.779	3.875	5.588**	4.592*	5.367**
SDS	-.032	-.031	-.027	-.031	-.034	-.030	-.034	-.035	-.031
	-.143	-.137	-.120	-.141	-.155	-.134	-.211	-.156	-.136
	1.299	1.176	.872	1.191	1.402	1.115	2.895	2.956	2.231
Education	.109	.116	.102	-.068	-.068	-.101	.004	.008	-.003
	.228	.244	.237	-.168	-.168	-.246	.008	.017	-.006
	1.611	1.771	1.644	.971	.971	2.119	.005	.020	.002
Income	.219	.207	.209	-.013	-.300	-.017	.117	.103	.111
	.252	.238	.240	-.016	-.037	-.021	.137	.122	.131
	4.044*	3.372	3.428	.013	.068	.024	2.287	1.714	2.005
Age	-.007	-.008	-.008	-.015	-.016	-.008	-.015	-.015	-.014
	-.065	-.069	-.072	-.134	-.135	-.072	-.126	-.130	-.115
	.275	.301	.349	.983	1.004	.283	1.919	1.714	1.600
Occupational Status	-.021	-.021	-.020	.294	.018	.024	.002	.001	.004
	-.294	-.297	-.280	.017	.295	.395	.024	.022	.062
	2.724	2.753	2.391	2.489	2.489	4.455*	.039	.032	.245
Efficacy		-.086	-.095		-.130	-.181		-.102	-.116
		-.066	-.072		-.100	-.139		-.078	-.089
		.289	.349		.591	1.196		.777	1.025
Strain			.125			.450			.213
			.094			.285			.151
			1.604			4.530*			2.845

TABLE 52

PASSIVE COPING IN ECONOMICS: SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 34

	Sample 1			Sample 2			Total		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Control	.139	.112	.081	.228	.271	.273	.188	.192	.176
	.183	.148	.107	.261	.310	.313	.229	.234	.214
	2.553	1.434	.633	5.574**	6.536**	5.882**	9.044**	8.039**	5.843**
SDS	-.030	-.027	-.026	-.042	-.050	-.050	-.037	-.037	-.037
	-.201	-.181	-.175	-.239	-.286	-.287	-.225	-.229	-.228
	3.292	2.509	2.332	4.483*	5.467*	5.402*	8.565**	7.989**	7.865**
Education	-.019	-.017	-.021	-.021	-.026	-.026	-.024	-.024	-.024
	-.060	-.053	-.065	-.064	-.079	-.080	-.073	-.074	-.074
	.260	.203	.302	.316	.473	.472	.833	.850	.838
Income	-.032	-.034	-.021	-.023	-.032	-.033	-.023	-.023	-.018
	-.056	-.059	-.037	-.036	-.049	-.050	-.037	-.038	-.029
	.204	.226	.083	.100	.188	.190	.205	.210	.119
Age	.014	.015	.017	.016	.019	.018	.015	.015	.016
	.184	.185	.219	.169	.198	.195	.170	.171	.189
	2.732	2.716	3.353	2.279	2.290	2.486	4.927*	4.915*	5.272**
Efficacy		.068	.045		-.094	-.093		-.009	-.020
		.093	.061		-.128	-.125		-.013	-.027
		.628	.224		.991	.913		.025	.100
Strain			.081			-.007			.043
			.116			-.009			.060
			.625			.005			.398

TABLE 53

STRESS IN MARRIAGE: SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 35

	Sample 1				Sample 2				Total			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Control	.832	.695	.448	.470	.319	.054	-.037	-.024	.614	.446	.217	.237
	.638	.534	.344	.360	.220	.037	-.025	-.016	.452	.329	.160	.175
	48.435**	28.857**	12.870**	15.100**	3.107	.079	.065	.027	35.871**	16.461**	5.489**	6.811**
SDS	-.033	-.028	-.113	-.007	-.023	-.130	-.156	-.006	-.031	-.024	-.014	-.007
	-.131	-.111	-.046	-.032	-.102	-.050	-.071	-.028	-.135	-.103	-.060	-.031
	1.975	1.483	.318	.163	.540	.188	.510	.075	2.808	1.757	.906	.255
Education	.058	.063	.052	.048	-.021	-.017	.016	.008	.015	.185	.024	.019
	.119	.128	.106	.098	-.045	-.038	.034	.017	.032	.040	.051	.040
	1.587	1.934	1.704	1.535	.101	.080	.119	.031	.150	.246	.631	.408
Income	.018	.023	.133	.118	-.117	-.071	-.085	-.076	-.060	-.048	.029	.029
	.020	.025	.146	.129	-.118	-.072	-.086	-.077	-.064	-.052	.031	.032
	.039	.068	2.684	2.282	.722	.299	.714	.615	.591	.412	.224	.234
Age	-.013	-.011	-.013	-.018	-.009	-.008	-.004	-.009	-.009	-.007	-.007	-.012
	-.107	-.091	-.105	-.141	-.079	-.067	-.035	-.076	-.075	-.062	-.062	-.100
	1.292	.989	1.731	2.216	.329	.269	.131	.583	.873	.638	.984	2.529
Efficacy		.342	.193	.098		.504	.218	.153		.390	.183	.099
		.228	.128	.065		.391	.169	.119		.281	.131	.070
		5.535**	2.172	.357		8.543**	2.580	1.178		12.105**	3.786	1.027
Strain			.456	.351			.615	.540			.555	.472
			.465	.357			.655	.575			.576	.489
			21.851**	11.513**			47.281**	27.913**			73.144**	45.141**
Passive Coping				.365				.229				.290
				.224				.173				.220
				6.043**				2.185				7.589**

TABLE 54

STRESS IN PARENTING: SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 36

	Sample 1				Sample 2				Total			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Control	.245	.083	-.034	-.008	.327	.243	.218	.172	.311	.171	.114	.063
	.254	.071	-.029	-.073	.268	.200	.178	.140	.251	.138	.092	.051
	2.927	.247	.052	.380	3.454	1.875	1.804	1.233	6.686**	2.114	1.112	.368
SDS	-.025	-.031	-.029	-.028	-.052	-.042	-.041	-.027	-.038	-.031	-.028	-.023
	-.125	-.155	-.143	-.141	-.266	-.214	-.207	-.139	-.185	-.150	-.138	-.112
	.648	1.209	1.323	1.535	.030	2.052	2.292	1.107	3.092	2.322	2.320	1.708
Education	.006	.032	.050	-.002	.003	.022	.008	-.019	-.004	.019	.018	-.023
	.015	.079	.125	-.005	.007	.052	.020	-.048	-.009	.045	.042	-.054
	.009	.305	.978	.002	.067	.108	.018	.116	.007	.189	.196	.340
Income	.039	[illegible]	.121	.162	-.160	-.123	-.065	-.025	-.071	-.026	.014	.058
	.049	.109	.156	.208	-.183	-.139	-.075	-.028	-.084	-.031	.017	.068
	.108	.629	1.646	3.407	.136	.835	.283	.044	.663	.101	.037	.635
Age	-.008	-.009	.003	-.005	-.014	-.013	.009	-.008	-.009	-.010	.004	-.006
	-.074	-.009	.031	-.046	-.113	-.103	.069	-.063	-.073	-.084	.036	-.053
	.229	.353	.058	.145	.017	.604	.277	.218	.541	.804	.164	.339
Efficacy		.532	.501	.395		.315	.282	.182		.446	.411	.343
		.468	.441	.347		.259	.233	.150		.374	.344	.265
		12.038**	13.819**	9.471**		3.405	3.311	1.432		16.238**	16.123**	10.132**
Strain			.449	.393			.486	.340			.423	.341
			.459	.402			.416	.291			.382	.308
			15.629**	13.887**			10.434**	4.876*			20.093**	13.835**
Passive Coping				.425				.543				.451
				.370				.341				.327
				9.939**				6.197**				13.546**

TABLE 55

STRESS IN OCCUPATION: SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 37

	Sample 1				Sample 2				Total			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Control	.305	.303	.234	.249	-.004	-.062	-.124	-.146	.169	.138	.074	.069
	.211	.209	.162	.172	-.004	-.061	-.125	-.142	.134	.110	.059	.055
	3.024	2.852	2.384	2.656	.001	.187	1.012	1.248	2.386	1.347	.590	.511
SDS	-.029	-.029	-.005	-.003	-.068	-.060	-.053	-.049	-.049	-.048	-.033	-.031
	-.116	-.118	-.022	-.013	-.332	-.296	-.254	-.242	-.214	-.211	-.145	-.136
	.888	.882	.043	.016	6.488**	5.333*	5.373*	4.435*	5.903*	5.974*	3.554	3.091
Education	.106	.105	.086	.080	.063	.064	.012	.000	.102	.096	.062	.056
	.204	.201	.164	.153	.167	.169	.032	.001	.225	.211	.135	.124
	1.319	1.235	1.162	1.000	.946	1.022	.047	.000	3.592	3.178	1.712	1.375
Income	-.080	-.077	-.062	-.041	-.121	-.080	-.059	-.066	-.111	-.090	-.063	-.061
	-.083	-.080	-.065	-.043	-.161	-.106	-.078	-.088	-.128	-.102	-.073	-.070
	.451	.398	.366	.155	1.309	.579	.416	.509	2.082	1.310	.867	.792
Age	-.014	-.014	-.010	-.011	-.004	-.004	.008	.010	-.010	-.009	-.003	-.003
	-.108	-.107	-.081	-.083	-.038	-.034	.078	.095	-.083	-.077	-.024	-.024
	.773	.751	.595	.632	.079	.063	.437	.618	.887	.763	.287	.287
Occupation Status	-.109	-.001	.006	.008	-.011	-.011	.000	.002	-.007	-.637	.004	.004
	-.014	-.013	.084	.107	-.199	-.191	-.017	.029	-.099	-.095	.058	.058
	.006	.006	.309	.493	1.127	1.095	.011	.028	.660	.623	.287	.287
Efficacy		.016	-.040	-.074		.312	.231	.228		.161	.100	.100
		.011	-.028	-.052		.261	.192	.190		.120	.074	.074
		.008	.074	.241		4.193*	2.941	2.861		1.982	.989	.989
Strain			.772	.719			.723	.744			.723	.709
			.530	.509			.497	.511			.496	.486
			27.695**	20.910**			17.731**	18.083**			43.376**	40.834**
Passive Coping				.184				.112				.104
				.109				.088				.069
				.910				.517				.780

TABLE 56

STRESS IN ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT: SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 38

	Sample 1				Sample 2				Total			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Control	.418	.234	.006	.002	.428	.215	.027	.066	.426	.236	.026	.037
	.351	.197	.005	.001	.365	.183	.023	.057	.360	.200	.022	.031
	11.025**	3.592	.002	.000	13.764**	3.565	.069	.439	26.219**	8.395**	.126	.254
SDS	-.043	-.023	-.016	-.017	-.039	.001	.003	-.003	-.042	-.103	-.010	-.014
	-.184	-.095	-.068	-.073	-.167	.006	.014	-.013	-.181	-.055	-.044	-.059
	3.236*	.979	.655	.745	2.739*	.004	.030	.026	6.526**	.673	.574	1.030
Education	.120	.135	.106	.103	.008	.035	.052	.042	.056	.079	.079	.073
	.242	.271	.214	.208	.017	.077	.114	.092	.118	.167	.167	.154
	5.021**	7.486**	5.947**	5.505*	.027	.710	2.203	1.452	2.575	6.206**	8.473**	7.163**
Income	-.046	-.058	.035	.031	-.083	-.028	.030	.029	-.059	-.038	.038	.036
	-.052	-.065	.039	.035	-.090	-.031	.032	.031	-.065	-.042	.041	.040
	.202	.385	.174	.139	.027	.710	2.203	1.452	.762	.387	.506	.465
Age	-.181	-.017	.002	.003	-.030	-.042	-.022	.023	-.023	-.028	-.084	-.008
	-.145	-.139	.019	.026	-.235	-.336	-.177	.179	-.180	-.224	-.067	-.063
	2.028	2.220	.049	.087	5.554*	13.326**	4.573*	4.966*	6.578**	12.129**	1.323	1.169
Efficacy		.465	.295	.295		.459	.363	.339		.453	.319	.310
		.402	.255	.254		.467	.367	.344		.428	.301	.293
		16.712**	7.828**	7.764**		20.251**	17.025**	15.490**		39.821**	23.481**	22.431**
Strain			.596	.604			.519	.520			.560	.568
			.544	.550			.517	.518			.539	.547
			25.248**	25.381**			32.320**	34.152**			61.860**	64.344**
Passive Coping				-.079				-.232				-.151
				-.047				-.160				-.097
				.346				5.059**				3.437

TABLE 57

SELF-ESTEEM: SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 39

	Sample 1		Sample 2		Total	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
Control	-.123	-.076	-.113	-.033	-.133	-.150
	-.218	-.134	-.169	-.049	-.184	-.084
	3.899	1.341	2.853	.218	6.430**	1.203
SDS	.008	.007	.029	.026	.019	.149
	.114	.094	.337	.238	.245	.190
	1.062	.753	10.107**	4.911*	10.321**	6.253**
Education	.009	.008	.030	.021	.017	.013
	.062	.056	.182	.129	.106	.081
	.308	.258	3.004	1.587	1.902	1.175
Income	.009	.002	.646	.470	.037	.026
	.031	.006	.198	.144	.123	.088
	.068	.003	3.746	2.073	2.583	1.360
Age	.002	.001	-.001	.000	.002	.002
	.005	.039	-.015	.006	.006	.005
	.257	.129	.023	.004	.006	.005
Efficacy		-.127		-.187		-.150
		-.231		-.320		-.271
		4.229*		7.980**		11.909**

APPENDIX 5

QUESTIONNAIRE FROM FINAL STUDY

I. Below and on the back of this page are some statements about how much control people have to solve problems that they encounter in everyday life. Read the statement and, on the numbered line below, indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with that item by circling a number. The number 1 represents the strongest agreement that you can express while the number 7 represents the strongest disagreement that you can express. In other words, the larger the number the stronger the disagreement and the smaller the number the stronger the agreement expressed.

An employee does not have the power to get rid of most types of job stresses.	(1)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
There are many marital problems that can't be solved.	(2)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
An employee who believes that she(he) is being treated unfairly can do something about it.	(3)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
An employee usually has the power to get rid of unpleasant working conditions.	(4)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
Often there aren't many things that the typical person at my income level can do to get rid of money problems.	(5)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
When problems with children occur, most parents find it impossible to exert a great deal of control over their children's behavior.	(6)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
When a child gets into trouble, most parents can't do anything to prevent it from happening again.	(7)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
Almost all conflicts between a parent and child can be solved if the parent tries hard enough.	(8)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
If a husband's habits are causing problems in a marriage, the average wife can probably do something to influence her husband to change.	(9)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
Most financial pressures are caused by factors that people cannot control.	(10)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
The average person doesn't have much control when confronted with money problems.	(11)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
If a child is not motivated to achieve and do well in life, there is not much that most parents can about it.	(12)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly
Whether or not marital problems improve depends mostly on the effort that each spouse puts into the marriage.	(13)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agree strongly	disagree strongly

TURN THIS PAGE OVER

When communications problems develop in a marriage, there is almost always something that a spouse can do to correct them. (14) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

Many strains upon a marriage cannot be changed by the average spouse. (15) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

Most parents have the power to change their child's behavior, even when the child seems to ignore parental advice. (16) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

A spouse usually has very little control over marital conflicts. (17) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

If someone is not receiving adequate pay for the kind of job she(he) is doing, there is almost always something that she(he) can do about it. (18) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

The majority of people at my income level do not have the power to control many of the financial strains that they experience. (19) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

Communications problems between a parent and child often cannot be resolved. (20) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

A parent can always do something to resolve problems that a child is having in school. (21) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

Most marital difficulties can be resolved if a spouse is willing to work at it. (22) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

It is often impossible for people at my income level to find ways to afford many needed items. (23) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

An employee in a position similar to mine cannot take direct action to get rid of many job problems. (24) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

Most employees have to put up with unfair treatment- often there is nothing that can be done about it. (25) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

It is seldom possible to change bad aspects of a marriage. (26) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

There are very few job problems that an employee cannot solve if she(he) really tries. (27) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

If an employee doesn't receive the recognition that she(he) deserves there probably isn't much that she (he) can do about it. (28) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

Under ordinary circumstances the average person has the power to solve most financial problems. (29) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

If someone really puts her(his) mind to it, she(he) can almost always improve a poor financial situation. (30) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
agree strongly disagree strongly

Below and on the back of this page are some questions and statements about being a parent. Circle the number on the scale beside each statement or question that best shows how you think or feel. IF YOU DO NOT HAVE CHILDREN GO TO PAGE 3.

How often do your children fail to get along with others the same age?	(31)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
How often do you give attention to carelessness about your child's personal appearance?	(32)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
How often do you have to give attention to your children's poor use of spare time?	(33)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
How often do you have to give attention to poor school work?	(34)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
How often do you have to give attention to your children having the wrong kind of friends?	(35)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
How often do you wonder if your children are not practicing the moral beliefs that are important?	(36)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
How often do you wonder if your children are trying hard enough to prepare for the life ahead of them?	(37)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
How often does it happen that you are treated without proper respect by your children?	(38)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
How often does it happen that your advice and guidance are ignored by your children?	(39)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often

BELOW ARE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT WAYS THAT A PERSON MIGHT TRY TO COPE WITH THE EVERYDAY STRESSES AND STRAINS OF BEING A PARENT. CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST SHOWS HOW OFTEN YOU USE THAT WAY OF COPING WITH THE EVERYDAY STRESSES OF BEING A PARENT.

When your children's behavior is troublesome, how often do you take away a privilege?	(40)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
When your children's behavior is troublesome, how often do you threaten some kind of punishment?	(41)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
When your children's behavior is troublesome, how often do you scold them?	(42)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
When your children misbehave, how often do you think that it's behavior that they will just outgrow?	(43)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
How often do you ignore what's going on when there is something troublesome in your children's behavior?	(44)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
How often do you tell yourself that something in your children's behavior is not really important?	(45)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often
How often do you look around at other parents to see how much better off you are than they?	(46)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never Very Often

TURN THIS PAGE OVER

How often do you decide there's nothing you can do to change things about your child?	(47)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
When your child's behavior is troublesome, how often do you remind yourself that things could be worse?	(48)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
How often do you try to notice only the good things about your child?	(49)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
The way my children are turning out depends on their inner nature and there is little I can do about it.	(50)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
There is only so much I can do as a parent and after that I just accept my children as they are.	(51)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly

BELOW ARE SOME WORDS THAT DESCRIBE FEELINGS. ON THE SCALE BY EACH WORD CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT SHOWS HOW MUCH YOU FEEL THAT WORD WHEN YOU THINK ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCES AS A PARENT.

When you think of your experiences as a parent, do you feel:

UNSURE OF YOURSELF?	(52)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all unsure — Extremely unsure	BOTHERED OR UPSET?	(56)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all bothered — Extremely bothered
FRUSTRATED:	(53)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all frustrated — Extremely frustrated	TENSE?	(57)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all tense — Extremely tense
WORRIED?	(54)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all worried — Extremely worried	UNHAPPY?	(58)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all unhappy — Extremely unhappy
EMOTIONALLY WORN OUT?	(55)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all worn out — Extremely worn out			

BELOW ARE SOME ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS ABOUT BEING A PARENT. AGAIN CIRCLE THE NUMBER ON THE SCALE THAT BEST SHOWS HOW YOU THINK OR FEEL ABOUT THAT STATEMENT.

When my child gets into trouble or has problems, I seem to be less capable of changing his(her) behavior than other parents would be under the same circumstances.	(59)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
I can't handle conflicts with my children as well as other parents probably could.	(60)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
When my child seems to ignore my advice, often I think that I am not as skillful a parent as other people.	(61)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
I am as capable as most people of altering my child's beliefs and values if I find them objectionable.	(62)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
I am at least as capable as most other parents would be of acting to resolve problems my child may have in school.	(63)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly

Below and on the back of this page are some questions and statements about finances and money. Circle the number on the scale beside each statement or question that best shows how you think or feel.

How often are you unable to afford the kind of clothing you should have?	(64)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never		Very Often
How do your finances work out at the end of the month?	(65)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Money left Over	Just Enough	Not Enough to Make Ends Meet
How often are you unable to afford the kind of food you should have?	(66)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never		Very Often
At the present time how easy would it be for you to afford the furniture or household equipment that needs to be replaced?	(67)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Very Easy		Very Difficult
How often are you unable to afford the leisure activities that you want?	(68)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never		Very Often
How many problems do you have in meeting the monthly payments on bills?	(69)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	No Problems At all		Many Problems

BELOW ARE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT DIFFERENT WAYS THAT A PERSON MIGHT TRY TO COPE WITH FINANCIAL AND MONEY STRAINS AND STRESSES. CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST SHOWS HOW OFTEN YOU USE THAT WAY OF COPING WITH EVERYDAY FINANCIAL STRAINS.

When you are short of money how often do you notice people around who are worse off than you?	(70)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
When you are short of money, how often do you just accept the money pinch because there's little you can do about it?	(71)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
When you are short of money, how often do you just tell yourself that money isn't worth getting upset about?	(72)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
When you are short of money, how often do you just think about more important things in life?	(73)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
When you are short of money how often do you just sit back and wait for things to work out by themselves?	(74)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
How do you think your standard of living will compare in a year or two to the one you have now?	(75)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Will Probably Be Much Better	Will Probably Be Much Worse

TURN THIS PAGE OVER

BELOW ARE SOME WORDS THAT DESCRIBE FEELINGS. ON THE SCALE BY EACH WORD CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT SHOWS HOW MUCH YOU FEEL LIKE THAT WORD WHEN YOU THINK ABOUT YOUR FINANCIAL SITUATION.

When you think of your financial situation, do you feel:

WORRIED? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (1) Not at all worried Extremely worried	TENSE? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (5) Not at all tense Extremely tense
CONTENTED? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (2) Not at all contented Extremely contented	INSECURE? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (6) Not at all insecure Extremely insecure
BOTHERED OR UPSET? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (3) Not at all bothered Extremely bothered	FRUSTRATED? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (7) Not at all frustrated Extremely frustrated
UNHAPPY? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (4) Not at all unhappy Extremely unhappy	RELAXED? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (8) Not at all relaxed Extremely relaxed

BELOW ARE SOME ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS ABOUT FINANCES AND MONEY. AGAIN CIRCLE THE NUMBER ON THE SCALE THAT BEST SHOWS HOW YOU THINK OR FEEL ABOUT THE STATEMENT.

I am not as capable of controlling my expenses as other people that I know.	(9)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
I lack the skills which permit most people to solve money problems.	(10)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
Even when money problems occur, I am as skillful as anyone else at dealing with them.	(12)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
I handle money as well as most people I know.	(13)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
I am not as capable of avoiding many financial problems as other people seem to be.	(14)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly

Below and on the back of this page are some questions and statements about your job. Circle the number on the scale beside each statement or question that best shows how you think or feel. IF YOU ARE NOT EMPLOYED AT THIS TIME, GO TO PAGE 5.

At work, how often do you have more work than you can handle?	(15)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
At work, how often are you under pressure to keep up with new ways of doing things?	(16)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
At work how often are you treated unfairly by another person?	(17)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
At work, how often do people treat you in an unfriendly way?	(18)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
At work, how often do people act toward you as if you are a person without real feelings?	(19)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
Are you in danger of illness or injury on the job.	(20)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
Do you work in a lot of dirt or dust?	(21)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
Do you have a lot of noise on the job?	(22)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
My work has good fringe benefits such as sick pay and retirement.	(23)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly
I can count on a steady income.	(24)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly

BELOW ARE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT DIFFERENT WAYS THAT A PERSON MIGHT TRY TO COPE WITH THE STRESSES AND STRAINS ON THE JOB. CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST SHOWS HOW OFTEN YOU USE THAT WAY OF COPING WITH STRESSES ON THE JOB.

How often do you just wait for difficulties on the job to work themselves out?	(25)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
How often do you remind yourself that for everything bad about your work situation there is also something good?	(26)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
How often do you tell yourself that difficulties at work are not important to you?	(27)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
How often do you try to pay attention only to your duties in order to overlook difficulties in the work situation?	(28)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
The most important thing about my job is that it provides me the things I need in life.	(29)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly
Time solves most problems on my job.	(30)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly
I have to accept my job as it is because there's nothing I can do to change it.	(31)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly
I can put up with a lot on my job as long as the pay is good.	(32)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly

TURN THIS PAGE OVER

As soon as I leave work, I put it out of my mind.	(33)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly
I don't really expect to get much pleasure out of work.	(34)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly
How often do you talk to others to find a solution to difficulties on the job?	(35)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
How often do you take some action to get rid of the difficulties in your work situation?	(36)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often
How often do you notice people who have more difficulties on the job than you do?	(37)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Never	Very Often

BELOW ARE SOME WORDS THAT DESCRIBE FEELINGS. ON THE SCALE BY EACH WORD, CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT SHOWS HOW MUCH YOU FEEL LIKE THAT WORD WHEN YOU THINK OF YOUR DAY-TO-DAY JOB.

When you think of your day-to-day job, do you feel:

RELAXED?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(38)	Not at all relaxed	Extremely relaxed
CONTENTED?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(39)	Not at all contented	Extremely contented
WORRIED?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(40)	Not at all worried	Extremely worried
BOTHERED OR UPSET?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(41)	Not at all bothered	Extremely bothered
TENSE?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(42)	Not at all tense	Extremely tense
UNHAPPY?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(43)	Not at all unhappy	Extremely unhappy
FRUSTRATED?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(44)	Not at all frustrated	Extremely frustrated

BELOW ARE SOME ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS ABOUT WORKING ON THE JOB. AGAIN CIRCLE THE NUMBER ON THE SCALE THAT BEST SHOWS HOW YOU THINK OR FEEL ABOUT THE STATEMENT.

Sometimes I think that I can't resolve job problems as well as my fellow employees.	(45)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly
Job pressures and problems that I experience are often due to the fact that I am not as capable of controlling what happens on the job as other people would be.	(46)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly
If I'm being treated unfairly on the job, I am as competent and capable as anyone else would be of changing the situation.	(47)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly
Even when I'm under a lot of pressure on the job, I am at least as good at solving job problems as the other people at work.	(48)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly
When job problems occur, I seem to be at least as skillful at solving them as most of the other people that I work with.	(49)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Agree Strongly	Disagree Strongly

Below and on the back of this page are some questions and statements about being married. Circle the number on the scale beside each statement or question that best shows how you think or feel. IF YOU ARE NOT MARRIED GO TO PAGE 6.

Generally I give in more to my husband's wishes than he gives in to mine.	(50)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
My spouse insists on having his own way.	(51)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
My spouse usually expects more from me than he is willing to give back.	(52)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
My spouse is someone who is a good wage earner.	(53)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
I cannot completely be myself around my spouse.	(54)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
My marriage doesn't give me enough opportunity to become the sort of person I'd like to be.	(55)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly

BELOW ARE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT DIFFERENT WAYS THAT A PERSON MIGHT TRY TO COPE WITH THE STRESSES AND STRAINS OF EVERYDAY MARRIED LIFE. CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST SHOWS HOW OFTEN YOU USE THAT WAY OF COPING WITH EVERYDAY STRESSES IN MARRIED LIFE.

How often do you tell yourself that marital difficulties are not important?	(56)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
How often do you wait for time to remedy the difficulty?	(57)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
How often do you keep so busy you don't have time to think about the difficulty?	(58)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
How often do you try to overlook your spouse's faults and pay attention only to good points?	(59)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
How often do you try to ignore difficulties by looking only at the good things?	(60)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
How often do you try to find a fair compromise in marriage problems?	(61)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
How often do you sit down and talk things out?	(62)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
How often do you keep out of your spouse's way for a while when you have differences?	(63)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
How often do you give in more than half way when you and your spouse have differences?	(64)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often
How often do you just keep hurt feelings to yourself when you and your spouse have differences?	(65)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never — Very Often

TURN THIS PAGE OVER

BELOW ARE SOME WORDS THAT DESCRIBE FEELINGS. ON THE SCALE BY EACH WORD CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT SHOWS HOW MUCH YOU FEEL LIKE THAT WORD WHEN YOU THINK ABOUT THE PLEASURES AND PROBLEMS OF YOUR DAILY LIFE WITH YOUR SPOUSE.

When you think of daily life with your husband, do you feel:

RELAXED? (66) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all relaxed — Extremely relaxed	BOTHERED OR UPSET? (71) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all bothered or upset — Extremely bothered or upset
WORRIED? (67) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all worried — Extremely worried	TENSE? (72) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all tense — Extremely tense
NEGLECTED? (68) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all neglected — Extremely neglected	FRUSTRATED? (73) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all frustrated — Extremely frustrated
BORED? (69) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all bored — Extremely bored	UNHAPPY? (74) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all unhappy — Extremely unhappy
CONTENTED? (70) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all contented — Extremely contented	

BELOW ARE SOME ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS ABOUT BEING MARRIED. AGAIN CIRCLE THE NUMBER ON THE SCALE WHICH BEST SHOWS HOW YOU THINK OR FEEL ABOUT THAT STATEMENT.

Even when problems occur, I am as capable of controlling what happens in my marriage as most other married people that I know.	(1)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
I am probably not as skillful as most other people are when it comes to resolving marital problems.	(2)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
My husband is more capable than I am when it comes to resolving marital problems.	(3)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
I am as capable a marriage partner as my spouse.	(4)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
Even under strain, I am as capable of controlling what happens in my marriage as anyone could be under the circumstances.	(5)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
I am as capable as anyone else would be of taking action to get rid of marital tensions.	(6)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly
I often feel that I can't resolve marital problems as well as other married people I know.	(7)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly — Disagree Strongly

On this page are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally. For each statement, either circle the word true or the word false.

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates. TRUE FALSE
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble. TRUE FALSE
3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. TRUE FALSE
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone. TRUE FALSE
5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life. TRUE FALSE
6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. TRUE FALSE
7. I am always careful about my manner of dress. TRUE FALSE
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant. TRUE FALSE
9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it. TRUE FALSE
10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. TRUE FALSE
11. I like to gossip at times. TRUE FALSE
12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. TRUE FALSE
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. TRUE FALSE
14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something. TRUE FALSE
15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. TRUE FALSE
16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. TRUE FALSE
17. I always try to practice what I preach. TRUE FALSE
18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people. TRUE FALSE
19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. TRUE FALSE
20. When I don't know something I don't mind admitting it. TRUE FALSE
21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. TRUE FALSE
22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. TRUE FALSE
23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. TRUE FALSE
24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings. TRUE FALSE
25. I never resent being asked to return a favor. TRUE FALSE
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. TRUE FALSE
27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. TRUE FALSE
28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. TRUE FALSE
29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off. TRUE FALSE
30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. TRUE FALSE
31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause. TRUE FALSE
32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved. TRUE FALSE
33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. TRUE FALSE

TURN THIS PAGE OVER

BELOW ARE SOME ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS YOU MAY HAVE ABOUT YOURSELF. AGAIN, CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST SHOWS YOUR RESPONSE TO THE STATEMENT.

I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	(8)	1 Disagree Strongly	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Agree Strongly
All in all, I am inclined to feel that I'm a failure.	(9)	1 Disagree Strongly	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Agree Strongly
I certainly feel useless at times.	(10)	1 Disagree Strongly	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Agree Strongly
I take a positive attitude toward myself.	(11)	1 Disagree Strongly	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Agree Strongly
I am able to do things as well as most other people.	(12)	1 Disagree Strongly	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Agree Strongly
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	(13)	1 Disagree Strongly	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Agree Strongly
I wish I could have more respect for myself.	(14)	1 Disagree Strongly	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Agree Strongly
At times I think I am no good at all.	(15)	1 Disagree Strongly	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Agree Strongly
I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	(16)	1 Disagree Strongly	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Agree Strongly
I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	(17)	1 Disagree Strongly	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Agree Strongly

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE PERSONAL AND, OF COURSE, YOU DO NOT HAVE TO ANSWER THEM. HOWEVER, THEY ARE IMPORTANT FOR THE RESEARCH AND IT WOULD BE HELPFUL IF YOU WOULD ANSWER THEM. OF COURSE THE ANSWERS YOU GIVE WOULD BE USED ONLY FOR THE RESEARCH, AND, OF COURSE, I WILL NOT KNOW WHO YOU ARE.

Which of these income groups represents your total family income during the past year (before taxes and other things)? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. $000-$4,999
2. $5,000-$9,999
3. $10,000-$14,999
4. $15,000-$19,999
5. $20,000-$24,999
6. $25,000 or more

(18)

What is your level of education?

GRADE SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL	COLLEGE	POST COLLEGE	
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16	17 18 19 20	(19-20)

How many children do you have in each of the age categories listed below? (21-25)

0-5 years____. 6-10 years____. 11-15 years____. 16-20 years____. 21 or over____.

Are you employed? No__ Yes__ (IF YOU ARE EMPLOYED) What job title best describes (26)
your job ________________________________ (27)

Are you currently married? No___ Yes___ What is your age? __________years. (28)
(29)

REFERENCES

Abramowitz, C. V., Abramowitz, S. I., Roback, H. B. & Jackson, C. Differential effectiveness of directive and nondirective group therapies as a function of client internal-external control. Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology, 1974, 42, 849-853.

Abramowitz, S. I. Internal-external locus of control and social political activism: A test of the dimensionality of Rotter's internal-external scale. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 196-201.

Abramson, L. Y., Seligman, M. E. P., & Teasdale, J. D. Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1978, 87, 49-74.

Alcoholics Anonymous. Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions. Alcoholics Anonymous Publishing, Inc., 1953.

Alloy, L. B. & Abramson, L. Y. Judgment of contingency in depressed and nondepressed students: Sadder but wiser? Journal of Experimental Psychology (Gen.), 1979, 108(4), 441-485.

Bandura, A. Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 1977, 84(2), 191-215.

Beck, A. T. & Beck, R. W. Screening depressed patients in family practice: A rapid technique, Postgraduate Medicine, 1972, 52, 81-85.

Beck, A. T., Ward, C. H., & Mendelson, M. An inventory for measuring depression, Archives of General Psychiatry, 1961, 4, 561-571.

Calhoun, L. G., Cheney, T., & Dawes, A. Locus of control, self-reported depression and perceived causes of depression. Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology, 1974, 42, 736.

Crandall, V. C., Katkovsky, W., & Crandall, V. J. Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcement in intellectual-academic situations. Child Development, 1965, 36, 91-109.

Cronbach, L. J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 297-334.

Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe, D. A new scale of social desirability in dependent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology. 1960, 24(4), 349-354.

Darlington, R. B. Multiple Regression. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 69(2), 161-182.

Davis, W. L. & Phares, E. J. Internal-external control as a determinant of information seeking in a social influence situation. Journal of Personality, 1967, 35, 547-561.

Ducette, J. & Soucar, E. Atypical patterns in locus of control and nonadaptive behavior. Journal of Personality, 1972, 38, 287-297.

Dweck, C. W. & Reppucci, N. D. Learned helplessness and reinforcement responsibility in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 109-116.

Emmelkamp, P. M. & Cohen-Kettenis, P. Relationship of locus of control to phobic anxiety and depression. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36, 390.

Falbo, T. & Beck, R. C. Naive psychology and the attributional model of achievement. Journal of Personality, 1979, 47(2), 185-195.

Fischoff, B. Attribution theory and judgment under uncertainty. In J. H. Harvey, W. J. Ickes, & R. F. Kidd (Eds.), New Directions in Attribution Research (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1976.

Gantz, M. & Good, P. R. An analysis of the effects of the forced choice format of Rotter's Internal-External Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1978, 34, 381.

Gore, M. Comments on Pearlin and Schooler. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1979, 20, 203.

Gregory, W. L. Locus of Control for positive and negative outcomes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36(8), 840-849.

Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R. C. & Beattie, M. Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of Negro youths. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 29-53.

Harman, H. H. Modern Factor Analysis, (2nd ed.), Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Hersch, P. D. & Scheibe, K. E. Reliability and validity of internal-external control as a personality dimension. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 609-613.

Howell, W. C. & Burnett, S. A. Uncertainty measurement: A cognitive taxonomy. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1978, 22, 45-68.

Kanungo, R. N. The concepts of alienation and involvement revisited. Psychological Bulletin, 1979, 86(1), 119-138.

Lamont, J. Depression, locus of control and mood response set. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1972, 28(3), 42-45.

Lao, R. C. Internal-external control and competent and innovative behavior among Negro college students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14(3), 263-270.

Lazarus, R. S. Cognitive and coping processes in emotion. In B. Weiner (Ed.), Cognitive Views of Human Motivation. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Lazarus, R. S. & Launier, R. Stress related transactions between person and environment. In L. A. Pervin & M. Lewis (Eds.), Perspectives in Interactional Psychology, 1978.

Lefcourt, M. Locus of Control: Current Trends in Theory and Research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1976.

Levenson, H. Activism and powerful others: Distinctions within the concept of internal-external control. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1975, 39, 377-383.

Loo, R. Locus of Control: A critical note. Psychological Reports, 1979, 44, 1117-1118.

Lowery, B., Jacobsen, B. & Keane, A. Relationship of locus of control to reoperative anxiety. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 1115-112.

Luginbuhl, J. E. R., Crowe, D. H., & Kahan, J. P. Causal attribution for success and failure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 86-93.

Marshall, J. R. Comments on Pearlin and Schooler. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1979, 20, 200-202.

Miller, D. C., Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement (3rd ed.). New York: David McKay, Inc., 1977.

Mischel, W., Zeiss, R., & Zeiss, A. Internal-external control and persistence: Validation and implications of the Stanford Preschool Internal-External Scale. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 265-278.

Moyal, B. R. Locus of control, self-esteem, stimulus appraisal, and depressive symptoms in children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 151-152.

Monat, A. & Lazarus, R. S. Stress and Coping. Columbia University Press, 1977.

Naditch, M. P., Gargan, M. & Michael, L. B. Denial, anxiety, locus of control, and the discrepancy between aspirations and achievement as components of depression. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1975, 84, 1-9.

Nicholls, J. G. Causal attribution and other achievement related cognitions: Effects of task outcome, attainment value and sex. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31(3), 379-388.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. R., Steinbrenner, J., and Bent, O. H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1970.

Nowicki, S., & Duke, M. P. A Locus of Control Scale for non college as well as college adults. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1974, 38, 136-137.

Nunnally, J. C. Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1967.

Pearlin, L. I., & Schooler, C. The structure of coping. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1978, 19, 2-21.

Pearlin, L. I. & Schooler, C. Answer to Marshall and Gore. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1979, 20, 203-205.

Phares, E. J. Locus of Control in Personality. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1975.

Phares, E. J. & Lamiell, J. T. Relationship of internal-external locus of control to defensive differences. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 872.

Platt, J. J., Pomeranz, D., Eisenman, B., & DeLisser, O. Importance of considering sex differences in relationships between locus of control and other personality variables. Proceedings, 78th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1970, 5, 463-464.

Reid, D. W. and Ware, E. E. Multidimensionality of internal versus external control: Addition of a third dimension and non-distinction of self versus others. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1974, 6(2), 131-141.

Reiss, A. J. Occupations and Social Status. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1961

Rosenberg, M. Parental interest and children's self-conceptions. Sociometry, 1963, 26(1), 35-49.

Rosenberg, M. Society and the Adolescent Self-Image. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Rothbaum, F. & Wolfer, J. Coping behavior and locus of control in children. Journal of Personality, 1979, 17, 118-135.

Roth, S. & Kubal, L. Effects of noncontingent reinforcement on tasks of differing importance: Facilitation and learned helplessness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 37(4), 680-691.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1, Whole No. 609).

Rotter, J. B. Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 48, 56-67.

Rotter, J. B., Chance, J. E. & Phares, J. E. Applications of a Social Learning Theory of Personality. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

Ryle, G. The Concept of Mind, Hutchinson House: London, 1952.

Sanger, S. P., & Alker, H. A. Dimensions of internal-external locus of control and the women's liberation movement. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 115-129.

Seligman, M. E. P. Helplessness: On Depression Development, and Death. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, Inc., 1975.

Seligman, M. E. P., Abramson, L. Y., Simmel, A., & von Baeyer, C. Depressive attributional style. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1979, 88, 242-47.

Stotland, E. The Psychology of Hope. San Francisco: Josey Bass, 1969.

Strickland, B. R. Internal-external expectancies and health related behaviors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46(6), 1192-1211.

Wallston, B. S., Wallston, D. A., Kaplan, G. D., & Maides, S. A. Development and validation of the Health Locus of Control (HLC) Scale. Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology, 1976, 44(4), 580-585.

Weiner, B. & Kukla, A. An attributional analysis of achievement motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 1-20.

White, R. Strategies of adaptation: An attempt at systematic description. In G. V. Coehlo, D. A. Hamburg, and J. E. Adams (Eds.), Stress and Coping, New York: Basic Books, 1974.

Williams, C. B. & Nickels, J. B. Internal-external control dimension as related to accident proneness. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 485-494.

Wolk, S. & DuCette, J. Intentional performance and incidental learning as a function of personality and task dimensions. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology_, 1974, _53_, 48-53.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Peterson, C., Semmel, G., Melatsky, L., Abramson, C., von Baeyer, & Seligman, M. E. P., The Attributional Style Questionnaire. Prepublication Draft, 1979.

2. George, L. L., & Siegler, I. C. Coping with Stress and Coping in Later Life: Older People Speak for Themselves. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, Center for the Study of Aging and Human Development and Department of Psychiatry, Duke University Medical Center, June, 1981.

BIOGRAPHY

Nancy Elisabeth Wells-Parker was born on April 24, 1950 in West Point, Mississippi. She graduated from West Point High School in 1968. In September of 1968 she entered Millsaps College where she majored in psychology and held a National Science Foundation Internship in Statistics. She was selected as a Woodrow Wilson Finalist. In May 1971, she graduated *magna cum laude* from Millsaps, receiving a Bachelor of Arts Degree. She received an NDEA IV Fellowship for doctoral work in psychology at Duke University in 1971. In May 1974 she received the Master of Arts Degree in Psychology from Duke University. In subsequent years she held the position of research associate at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and at Mississippi State University. While at Mississippi State University she received a grant from the Andrus Foundation of the National Retired Teachers' Association and the American Association of Retired Persons to study stress factors in the lives of elderly problem drinkers. In 1981 she received the Doctor of Philosophy Degree with a major in psychology from Duke University.